

4

# VINDICIÆ CLAVIVM:

OR,

A Vindication of the *KEYES* of the *King-*  
*dome of Heaven*, into the hands of  
the right Owners.

Being some *Animadversions* upon a *Traët* of  
Mr. I. C. called, *The Keyes of the King-*  
*dome of Heaven.*

As also upon another *Traët* of his; called, *The way of the*  
*Churches of NEW-ENGLAND.*

Manifesting ;

1. *The weaknesse of his proofes.*
2. *The Contradictions to himselfe, and others.*
3. *The Middle-way (so called) of Independents, to be the Ex-*  
*treme, or By-way of the Brownists.*

By an earnest well-wisher to the *Truth.*

*I E R. 6. 16. Stand ye in the wayes, see and aske for the old pathes,*  
*where is the good way, and walke therein.*

---

*7be 4 C* LONDON,  
Printed by T. H. for Peter Whaley, and are to be sold in *Ivy-Lane,*  
at the *Signe of the Gun.* 1645.





Printed by T. H. for the Society and sold by the  
at 102, Strand, London, W.C. 2.



## To the R E A D E R.



*I* *t is true, which the Prefacers to the*  
*Tract, called, The way of the*  
*Churches of Christ in New-*  
*England, do say, That we have long*  
*called for a fuller Declaration of*  
*themselves. For all that hath as yet*  
*bin published, hath not satisfied our expectation, Nor do*  
*we think them able to satisfy any unprejudiced man. The*  
*32. Questions, The Apologeticall Narration, The*  
*Reasons of the dissenting Brethren, The way of the*  
*Churches, &c. Now by them published, have all been*  
*answered ; which yet these Brethren take no notice of.*  
*The Keyes are now in question, in the following dis-*  
*course, how well they doe fit the words in The way des-*  
*cribed, or how suitable they are to the parties allowed to*  
*wear them. There is one thing very suspicious, That*  
*the Brethren doe not agree among themselves, in the*



## TO THE READER.

use and application of them: For those two Brethren tell us in their Epistle, That they hold with the Churches of New-England, yet it is evident they agree not with their Author, in The way: For they professe, That they doe not yet fully close with some expressions, passim, (frequent) in the Booke, before some of which, (belike there are more) they minded it, to note a Star in the Margin. This they could not but say and doe (*pace tanti Authoris*) or they could not assert the Booke. And will this satisfie any indifferent Reader? In the Title page, they promise us a full declaration of the Church-way in all particulars. But in the second page of their Epistle, they tell us, They doe not close with some expressions in the Book; And there are no lesse than ten Stars affixed in the margine of the Booke; wherein they intimate, they cannot assert the Booke. Of the same minde are the other two Brethren, the Prefacers to the Keyes; and that not in bare expressions, but in Doctrinall assertions. How should such Tracts satisfie us, when themselves are not satisfied? And no marvel, for those Brethren, in their Apologetical Narration, doe (wisely) professe, they keep a reserve open, to alter their judgments, upon occasion of New-light. Besides this, it is evident, that the Author of the Keyes, does directly con-

## TO the READER.

*contradict the Authour, of The way, that is, himself, which, when I have pleaded to some friends of his, I have been told, that he hath altered his judgement, since he writ The way, in many particulars. I have heard indeed he hath often altered his judgement since he went to New-England : But I cannot well beleeye it in this ; because the Prefacers to The way, bring us his Ep.p.3. owne words, in a Letter newly written, comming to their hands, when their Epistle was in the Presse ; wherein he affirms, That there is not a jot of difference in any Doctrine of Divinity, or Church practise. So Mr. Cotton, in his Letter to Mr. R.M. If it be true, that he hath altered his opinion since he writ the Way, they have done him wrong to publish it, after the Keyes, wherein the alteration is ; If he have not, they would be requested to reconcile him to himselfe. For I find he doth as flatly contradict himselfe, as ever any man did. I will instance but in one place. (and leave the rest to the following Discourse.) In the Keyes, page 4. he sayes, The Keyes were delivered to Peter, as an Apostle, as an Elder, and as a Beleever. The sense of the words (sayes he) will be most full, if all the severall considerations be taken joynly together. But in The way, page 27, he sayes, The power of the Keyes is given to the Church, to Peter, not as an Apostle, not as an Elder,*



## TO the READER.

der, but as a profest Beleever, in the name of Beleevers, &c. Is not this a flat contradiction? and yet the Prefacers seeme to approve it, for they set no Starre in the margine. I shall leave it to them to reconcile. How justly then may we call for a fuller Declaration? and how unjustly doe the Brethren quarrell us for calling for it? Doe not they themselves promise us yet a fuller Treatise of the same Subject, with amplier demonstrations, by joynt consent of the Churches of Old and New-England? Thats it that we expect, the joynt-consent of the Churches and Brethren; for their inconstancy, and difference in judgement, hath caused, as our non-satisfaction, so our just lamentation, That they should rend a poore-rent-already. Church into peeces, by setting up the practise of a New way, and not be agreed of the platforme whereby they practise. There are (as I touched before) no lesse then ten severall Stars, affixed by these Brethren; wherein, I should conceiv<sup>e</sup>, they differ from their Authour (if not their Master) not in bare exprelsions, but in the Doctrine there delivered, as page 45. Whether the Church hath power to proceed against all her Officers, if they be culpable in hereticall Doctrine, or scandalous crime: The Authour holds the affirmative; they seeme to hold the Negative. Again, page 53. Whether

## To the READER.

ther a Church may consist of lesse than seven, p. 55.  
VVhether confession of sinnes, and profession of  
faith be necessary for a member admitted, page 68.  
VVhether sitting at the Sacrament, have a Symbo-  
licall use (made by Christ him'selfe) to teach the  
Church their Majority over their Ministers in  
some cases, &c In these and the rest, we are unsatisfied,  
and these Brethren may doe well to declare their judge-  
ment in their fuller Treatise promised. This disagree-  
ment amongst themselves, is prejudicious to their cause  
and way, to those that are judicious, that are not sworn  
to the words of any Master, but Christ; much more, when  
the same person is not at agreement with himself; which,  
if it be not the case of the Authour of the Keyes, I  
referre to the judgement of the indifferent Reader,  
when he hath read the following Discourse.


---

✱ ✱

Ani-

---





## Animadversions upon the Brethrens Epistle to the Reader.

**I**T is indeed the great *controversie* of the times, [*What is the compleat subject of Church-power, or the power of the Keyes.*] These *Brethren* say, (perhaps truly) that the *Truth* herein hath been long lost in a double *extreme* : The one was the *tyranny* of the *Clergy* (so called) or rather of the *Prelacy*, who ingrossed all, or the chiefe part of that power unto themselves, not only from the people, but also from the *Pastors* of particular Congregations. The other is, the *Anarchy* or popularity of the *Separatists*, or *Brownists*, (as they after call them) who gave the people a place and claime to the whole power, and made the *Elders* set over them; but their servants to exercise that power which was properly theirs.

Probable it is, that *Truth* may lye in the *middle*, between these two *extremes* ; but how to find it out, is not so easie. Our *Brethren* goe about it ; but, me thinks they doe not hit it : They say, [*The Saints* (in these knowing Times) *finding that the Key of knowledge* hath so far opened their hearts, that they see with their owne eyes into the *substantial*s of god-knesse, &c. They doe begin more than to suspect, that some share in the *Key of power* should likewise appertaine unto them.] Truly

*Animadversions upon the Brethrens, &c.*

Truly just one as much as another: The Brethren suppose the Saints have a share in the *Key of Knowledge*; when they say, they suspect they have likewise a share in the *Key of power*. But first, they have no share in the *Key of knowledge*, (which is, *preaching and administration of the Seales*, as the Authour speaks) except *passively*, as to have their hearts opened by it (as the Brethrens words are:) So, nor have they any share in the *Key of power*, except it be by a voluntary [*consent, in obedience to the Will and Rule of Christ*] as the Authour himselfe speaks, page 15. And divers times elsewhere, as we shall heare; [*even an orderly subjection, according to the Order of the Gospell*, page 11.] Though the truth is, some have taken more upon them than to suspect they have a share, even to practise the *Key of power*, and that [*through the instruction and guidance of their Teachers*]; which, how little it comes short of the plea and practise of the other extreme, shall ere long appeare. For the present: These Brethren say, they conceive [*the disposall of this power may lye in a due allotment into divers hands, according to their severall concernments, rather than in an entire and sole trust committed to any one man, or any one sort, or ranke of men, or Officers*.] Herein perhaps we might agree with them: But I am sure they agree not with their Authour herein, who places all the power in one sort of men alone; that is, the Brethren without Officers, and gives them leave [*to elect, ordaine Officers, admit members, and passe Church censures without any Officers. yea, to censure all their Officers*.] though, we thinke, he contradicts himselfe in this Tract of the *Keyes*. The way, p. 45

The Brethren tell us, The Authour (to whom they Preface) takes upon him to distribute the bounds of this power. And layes downe this as a maxime; [*That looke in whose hands soever it fall, they have it immediately from Christ*; that



## Animadversions upon the Brethrens

is, in regard of delegation or dependance on each other.] And thus farre we doe not dissent: [*He then (say they) considers the power of a Congregation; which supposing to have a Presbytery of its owne, he asserteth to be the prime subject of entire power within it selfe yea, and the sole native subject of the power of Ordination and Excommunication.*] But 1. he needed not to have made such a supposition, that the Congregation hath a Presbytery of its owne: For if they have no Presbytery of their owne, he asserteth, that *they have the power of Ordination and Excommunication*, which is the highest censure within themselves; and [*want a Warrant to repaire to the Presbytery of another Church for either.*] 2. Both he and these Brethren know, that this is denied by many, who make the first Subject of all Church-power to be the *generall visible Church*, and secondarily the Congregation, though having a Presbytery of its owne: As a man is the first subject of Ridibility, *Peter*, but at second hand. The Congregation consisting of Elders and Brethren; [*For as for women and children, there is a speciall exception by a Statute Law of Christ, against their enjoyment of any part of this publicke power*] (say the Brethren) which I see no reason for, in regard of some part of this power, (as we shall see anon) the Authour labours to share the interest and power between the Elders and the Brethren. And he manifests it (say they) by way of a parallell. [*As in some of our Townes corporate, the power is given to a company of Aldermen the Rulers, and a Common Councell, a Body of the people.*] But I pray observe the dissimilitude in this similitude: His maine designe is, to give the people a share in the Church power of Government: But then the parallell will not run even. For the Company of Aldermen, and the Common-Councell, are both Rulers of the Corporation, though in severall ranks and subordination: But I suppose, neither

The way p.  
50, 51.

## Epistle to the Reader.

neither the Authour, nor the Brethren, can truly say, the whole company of the people are Rulers in the Church, as the Common-Councell is in the Corporation. If all the people be Rulers, who are the *ruled*? In the City there are multitudes of people, subject to the Company of Aldermen, and Common-Councell; but here are all *Governours*, or *governed*. The parallell were fairely laid thus: The Company of Aldermen, resemble the Pastors and Teachers; The Common-Councell, the Ruling-Elders (Officers of another ranke;) The Citizens besides those, the Brethren out of Office, in the Congregation. Thus all things correspond well. But they make the Presbytery to be the Aldermen, and the whole Body of the people to be the Common-Councell; which sure they are not, what ever they say; for then the distinction of *Rulers* and *ruled* is lost: And this appeares clearly in his application of this similitude. [*He gives to the Elders or Presbytery, a binding power of Rule and Authority; unto the Brethren, a power to concur with them; and that such affaires should not be transacted without a joynt-agreement of both.*] What power? such as the Common-Councell hath in the Corporation: thats more than a bare priviledge; thats a power of Rule and Authority, a binding power, concurring with the Aldermen; But they should have said: Not the Common-Councell, but the Common people of a City, have such a power to concur with the Aldermen, that such affaires be not transacted, but with their joynt-agreement. But this they cannot say, and then the parallell will not hold, unlesse they change the Common-people for the Common-Councell, thus. As the people of a City only cannot proceed to any publicke sentence, unlesse they have Aldermen over them: so, nor have the Aldermen power to sentence without the concurrence



*Animadversions upon the Brethrens*

of the people, which is apparently false. The parallell must be thus: As the *Brethren* only cannot proceed to any publick censure without their *Elders*: so, nor have the *Elders* power to censure without the concurrence of the *Brethren*, which is as false as the former. Indeed these are very parallell: As on the one side, the Common-Councell cannot doe any valid act, without the Aldermen; nor the Aldermen, without the Common-Councell, (unlesse there be some reserved cases) so, as the *Ruling-Elders* cannot censure without the *Pastor*, so nor the *Pastor*, without the *Ruling-Elders*; but applied to the Brethren, is (as in the City, if so it were) to make the *Government* popular, as those doe, that are in the one *extreme*, or I understand nothing. And then, the last clause of the Brethren, is to be paralleld thus: As the Common-Councell have not power of censuring the whole Court of Aldermen; nor the Aldermen, the whole Common-Councell, though together they have power over any particular person or persons of each: so the Presbytery alone, have not power of excommunicating the whole Body of the Brethren; nor the Brethren, the Presbytery, though together they have power over any person in each: But then thers one thing wanting; The Aldermen and Common-Councell have power over all the people of the City, as well as over particular persons amongst themselves. But in these Brethrens way; There are no other people, over which the Presbytery and Brethren should have power; and so the *Scene* is mislaid. I only note againe, That the Brethren and the Authour are not both of one mind: They say, [*The Brethren only could not proceed to any publick censures, without they have Elders over them, nor retio:*] But whether he say, [*The Elders have power to censure the Body of the Brethren*] or no, we shall heare anon; this I am sure  
he

## Epistle to the Reader.

he sayes : [*The Brethren have power to censure the whole Presbytery,*] as was noted afore. The way, p. 45.

The next thing which they *comment* on, is the power of *Synods*, because *Congregations* may miscarry. [*Wherein* (say they) *he grants an Association of Churches, as an Ordinance of Christ, with power above that of a Congregation, a Ministeriall power, to determine and enioyne things concerning the Congregations.*] The words are full and faire, but the sense is flat and empty : For all this power of *determining* and *enjoyning*, is but *Doctrinall*, or *declarative*, differing nothing in kind from the power of every single *Pastor*, but in degree of weight, as a *greater Testimony* ; as three cords twisted together, are stronger than each of them single. A power not binding or loosing, but *doctrinally* only, not armed with power of *censures*, if *injunctions* be not obeyed. But if this power of the *Synod*, be not *juridicall*, what is it ? All power in those *Pastors* thus assembled as an *Ordinance* of Christ, is either a power of *Order*, or of *jurisdiction* : The power of *determining* or *decreeing* together, is not the power of *Order* ; for then every *Pastor*, quâ *Pastor*, by virtue of his *Order*, might *decree* and impose it upon the *Congregation* : which is denied by all ; Therefore it must be a power of *jurisdiction* ; which yet these *Brethren*, and their *Authour* doe deny. And if it be not armed with power of *censure*, it will come to nothing ; as shall appeare hereafter. For as for their *withdrawing communion*, it will be little regarded by an offending obstinate *Congregation*.

Every Minister hath in himselfe, alone, a Ministeriall Doctrinall Authority, over the whole Church that is his charge, and every person in it, Ep. p. 9.

The *Brethren Epistolers* now begin to applaud themselves as *jumping* in judgement with their *Authour*, though so farre remote as *New-England* (But men agree in error sometimes, that never knew one another.) Their *middle way*, is this very way held forth by this *Authour*. Yet they say afterwards,



## *Animadversions upon the Brethrens*

wards, in some things, in his Discourse, *Hic Magister non tenetur*. They say, [*It is the middle way, between that which is called Brownisme, and the Presbyteriall Government, as it is practised, &c.*] But if they remember themselves well, the two extremes were *Prelacy* and *Brownisme*: [*Whereof the one doth in effect put the chiefe (if not the whole) of the Rule and Government into the hands of the people, &c. The other taking the principall parts of that Rule (the due of each Congregation) into the jurisdiction of a common Presbytery of severall Congregations &c.*] I appeale their wisdom, if the latter part doe not better fall upon the *Prelacy*; who in the other extreme, tooke the principall parts of *Rule* (due in part to the Pastors of Congregations) into their owne hands. Then the *middle way*, may chance fall out to be the *Presbyteriall way*, and not theirs. For certainly, that is between those two extremes. And *their way*, I dare say, (and hope to make it appeare) comes nearer to *Brownisme*, than the *Presbyteriall way*, to the *Prelaticall*. For the present, only marke; That the *Presbyteriall way*, gives the power of Church Government, neither to the *Clergy* alone, as the *Prelacy*, nor to the people alone, or chiefly, as the *Brownists* doe, but to both. For the *Presbyteries* (Classicall as well as Congregationall) consist of *Pastors*, and *Ruling-Elders*, who are the Representatives of the people, and chosen by their consent. But to give the Brethren, the people alone, without Officers, a power, to elect, ordaine, censure, &c. (as the Authour doth, whatever these Brethren doe) is to put, not only the *chiefe* (as *Brownists* doe) but the *whole* of the *Rule* into their hands: which, for ought I know, the *Brownists* doe not. Nor doth the *Presbytery* swallow up the peoples *interests*, (as they affirme) for their *interest* is saved, in their *Ruling-Elders*, chosen by themselves; as the *interest* of the common people of a Corporation,

## Epistle to the Reader.

ration, is saved in their Common-Councell, chosen by themselves. And that the *votes* of the *Elders* of that Congregation concerned, should be swallowed up in the *Classis*, &c. is no more absurd, than that the *votes* of the Burgesse of a Corporation, should be swallowed up in the Parliament; or that the *votes* of the *Elders* should be swallowed up in a *Synod*, confessed to be the *Ordinance* of Christ; unless the Brethren thinke, a *Synod* may not *determine* or *decree* any thing without the joynt-consent of every *Elder* there assembled.

After all this agreement of the Brethren, with this absent Authour, (to a *wonder*, if not to a *miracle*, as they would have us thinke, though we beleeve they were not strangers to the plot of this Authour, either before or since his going over) they enter their *dissent*, against some opinions and passages of this Authour, in the platforme by him described. I purpose not here to *debate*, much lesse to decide the *controversie* between them. I only desire to have it observed, That it may rather seeme a *wonder*, that these and other Brethren, having so long studied and professed this *middle way*, should not yet be able to walke hand in hand therein. When will they be agreed, that we may see their *new platforme* to be *uniforme*? One of them must needs be beside the way, and why may not both? But we shall observe greater *differences* than these hereafter.

They now againe resume the difference between the peoples interest, and the *Elders Rule* and Authority; and illustrate it by the former similitude, [Of a Company of Aldermen, and a Common-Councell, or Body of the people, in some Corporations, where the interest of the one is distinct from the other: so as without the concurrence of both, nothing is esteemed as a City act:] But so as in this Company of the Elders, this



## *Animadversions upon the Brethrens*

*power is properly Authority, but in the people is a privilege or power.* ] Enough hath been said to this already: Only I would know why they call the Common-Councell a Body of the people? Sure they doe not know any Corporations, I thinke, where the whole Corporation meets with the Aldermen, as a Body. The Common-Councell are a distinct Body from the common-people; a Body *representative* only. But then the parallell is spoiled; for the *Brethren* as distinct from the *Elders*; are not a *representative* Body, for whom should they represent? And if all the people of a corporation should meet as the Common-Councell, so that nothing may be esteemed as a City Act, without their concurrence; Surely the *Government* were *Democraticall*: The great mistake in the plot is; That the Presbytery is compared to the Court of Aldermen, and the Brethren to the Common-Councell. But so they are not; for the Common-Councell are *Governours* of the Corporation. It cannot be said, in the Company of Aldermen it is Authority, but in the Common-Councell a *privilege*; for it is Authority also in the Common-Councell; and if it be so in the Brethren (as it must, if they be parallell to the Common-Councell) I see not but the *Independent way*, and the way of the *Brownists*, one of the *extremes* forementioned, is one and the same. And let the *Brethren* consider, whether the *Brownists* doe not select two or three, or more persons, and put them in *Office*, and be-trust them with an entire *interest* of power for a multitude, to which that multitude ought (by a command from Christ) to be subject and obedient, as to an *Ordinance*, to guide them in their consent; and in whose sentence, the *ultimate formall Ministeriall Act* of binding and loosing shall consist; and yet place the *Rule and Authority*, originally and chiefly in the people; And then see how little difference there is between

The multitude of the Church doth ordinarily execute all discipline and censures by the Presbyters; & the Presbyters by their consent. The way,

## Epistle to the Reader.

tween themselves, and them. Its true indeed, that without the concurrence of the Aldermen and Common Councell, in the major part, nothing is esteemed as a City Act : But without the concurrence of the *body* of the people it is. So without the concurrence of the *Pastors* and *Elders*, nothing is to be esteemed as a Church act ; but (if the parallell be right) without the Brethren it is. That the *Brethren* have any power of concurrence with the *Elders* in their Acts, is begged, not proved. And their owne words confute it: [*The multitude* (say they) *ought* (by a command from Christ) *to be subject and obedient to the power of the Elders, as to an Ordinance, &c. as Rulers set over them:*] But if they ought to be subject and obedient to the acts of their Elders or Rulers, they have no more concurrence to their acts by way of power, than the common people have to the acts of the Aldermen and Common-Councell ; which is a meere *passive* concurrence and consent.

The next similitude of a *Virgin*, is nothing parallell to the case in hand. [*A Virgin* (say they) *hath a power ultimately to dissent, upon an unsatisfied dislike, and the match is not valid, without her consent.*] But the common people in a Corporation, have no such power *ultimately* to dissent (then againe the Government were *Democraticall.*) And if they give this power to the Brethren *ultimately* to dissent ; they give them more than an *interest*, even a power of *Authority*, to annull all acts and censures made by the Elders ; which, I take it, is no lesse than *Brownisme* ; for they can say no more.

Againe, they suppose [*a Government tempered of Aristocracy and Democracy, in which the people have a share, and their actual consent is necessary to all Lawes and sentences ; whereas, a few Nobles that are set over them, in whom the formall sanction*



## *Animadversions upon the Brethrens*

*sanction of all should lye, in these it were Rule and Authority, in that multitude, but power or interest.] But I pray, is not that Government, where the peoples actual consent (and so their dissent) is necessary to all Lawes and sentences, meereley popular, and in shew only Aristocraticall? The case is just the Brownists: Their Church seemes to be tempered of Aristocracy in their select Officers, chosen and ordained by themselves (as yours are) and Democracy in the body of the people. But they granting the peoples actual consent (and dissent) necessary to all Acts and sentences, swallow up the votes of the Elders, and so their Government is wholly or chiefly popular. Give such a power to the people (as you doe) and I will use your owne words: [All that is said in the New Testament about the Rule of the Elders, and the peoples obedience to them, is to be lookt upon, but as Metaphors, and to hold no proportion with any substantiall reality of Rule and Government.]*

The Brethren, to make their way more plausible, shew a reason of the difference between the Times of the Old and New Testament. [Then the Church was in her Nonage; and therefore the sole power of all Church-matters, was in their Tutors and Governours: But now the Church is out of her Nonage, and more generally able, being visible Saints (as they should be) to joyne with their guides, &c.] But they forget themselves presently, confessing, [the weaknesse and unskilfulnesse of the people (for the generality of them) in comparison of their Officers, gifted for the Government: He hath therefore placed a Rule and Authority in those Officers over them, not directing only, but binding; so as not only nothing should be done without them, but not esteemed validly done, unlesse done by them.] Now I pray, was it any more in the Government of the Church of the Old Testament: were not they to be visible Saints?

WERE

## Epistle to the Reader.

were not their *Guides* gifted for that purpose, suitable to those *Times*? And I think the *Brownists* may grant them thus much: Their *Officers* are but the Churches servants, and yet they say nothing may (in an ordinary way of Church-Government) be done without them, nor validly done, unlesse done by them. But I marvell they should call the power of the *Elders* a binding power, when as they said before; [*The Elders had no power to censure without the concurrence of the people, as nor the people without the Elders.*] which is just the same which *Brownists* say.

Nor can this *ballancing* of the power prevent *Anarchie* (what ever it may doe, *Tyranny*) for certainly if the peoples *consent* and concurrence be necessary to every Church-act, its an easie thing for them to bring in *Anarchy*, being alwaies the greater number, and so to swallow up the votes of the *Elders*, as *Brownists* doe.

That Ministeriall *Doctrinall Authority* should be severed from the power of *excommunication*, in some parties, we never doubted; because *excommunication* is an act of *jurisdiction*, which is common to many; but *Doctrinall Authority* is an afflux of *Order*. But to sever Rule and Authority from the power of concurrence to excommunication and censures, (as they doe in the people) is a meer nullity of Rule and Authority too.

That the power of *excommunication* should be inseparably linked to a Congregation; they would faine illustrate by a knowne comparison; As the custome is in our Land, [*The sentencing of a man to death, is not by Lawyers nor by Judges alone, but by his Peeres, a lury of men like himselfe.*] Their *similitude* still halts on the maine legge: For who are the *Judges* with them, but the *Presbytery*? and who are the *Jury*, but all the *Brethren*? But this is not so in a Corporation:



### *Animadversions upon the Brethrens*

All the City are not the Delinquents *Peeres*, but a *select dozen* of men. Now suppose a man be accused as an offender in a *Corporation*; shall the *whole City* be his *Peeres* or *Jury*, to try him? have they any such *interest* or *priviledge*? is their consent or dissent regarded? So the parallell required. If a brother deserve censure, he shall not be judged by the *Pastors* alone, or with the *Elders*, chosen by the people (as his *Jury*) for the *Government* of the Congregation; but all the people are to be his *Peeres* or *Jury*: This were strange to see in a City, and would breed nothing but *Anarchy* and confusion. So in the Church:

That Christ hath not betruſted a *generall Assembly* of *Elders*, with that power he hath done the Congregation, is begged, not proved. The reason is invalid: [*Because* (say they) *they are abstracted from the people.*] But thats not true; for the people are there *representatively* in their *Elders*, who are able to represent the case of the offender, with all the circumstances, as fully as if all the people were there present.

But Christ (say they) [*would have this Tribe of men (the brethren) personally concurring, not by delegation alone, not to the execution only, but even to the legall sentence also, of cutting men off:*] This is all begged, and is the question. And it is, as if they should say (in the parallell instance) God would have all the *Corporation* personally concurring to the legall sentence, or cutting off a malefactor, not by delegation only (as the *Jury* doe) nor to the execution only; which were a strange confusion. So that, as at the *Assizes*, the multitude of the people present, have no concurrence to the legall sentence, &c. but the *Judge* and *Jury* only: so the *Brethren* are to have no concurrence to the legall sentence of *excommunication*, (except to yeeld obedience in the execution) but the *Elders*

## *Epistle to the Reader.*

*Elders* only: and so the parallell is full.

And to conclude, if the *distance of the Presbyteries* Claf-  
ficall, &c. may *necessitate* the censure to pertaine to the par-  
ticular Congregation, because of the *circumstances* better  
knowne to them: By the same reason, *every Towne* where a  
malefactor lives, should have the *Sessions* kept amongst  
them; because there the person and fact is better knowne, and  
not one man to be absent from the censure: Nay, a man being  
to be *excommunicated* out of a particular Church, is *excom-  
municated* out of all Churches, therefore all the Chur-  
ches must be present at the censure.

---

*Vindicie*

---

---







# VINDICIÆ


Clavium :

OR,

## A Vindication of the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven.

### CHAP. I.

*What the Keyes be, and what their power.*

- I.  Hat by the *Kingdome of Heaven*, is meant both the Kingdome of *Glory*, which is above, and the Kingdome of *Grace*, which is the *Church* on Earth, I easily grant. But I only desire (in the beginning of this discourse) to be informed what you meane by the *Church* : Whether 1. The *invisible and myſticall Church* of true Beleevers opposed to *Reprobates* ; or 2. The *Catholicke viſible Church*, opposed to *Heathens* ; or 3. The
- B



The way p. 1.

3. The *particular Congregation* of Beleevers associated in Church-communion, as you use to speake. If we may guesse at your meaning by the whole proceeding of this Tract; or by your *discovery* of your selfe in the other Discourse, ealled, *The way of the Churches* in New-England; (which though it was published after this of the *Keyes*, yet was written, and went up and downe in the darke before it) I thinke you meane it in the latter sence, for a *particular Congregation*. For your first Proposition, there gives us this Resolution; [*That the Church which Christ in the Gospell hath instituted, and to which he hath committed the Keyes &c. is coetus fidelium, a combination of godly men, commonly called a particular visible Church.*] But of all the rest, this is the most improbable sence of our Saviours words, *Mat. 16. 19.* For 1. By the *Kingdome of Heaven* (on Earth) he meanes that Church, of which he had spoken before, in *v. 18.* But that was, either the *Catholicke visible Church*, or rather, *the invisible mysticall Church*; for that only is built upon the rocke, and against that the gates of hell shall never prevaile: whereas, *particular Churches* may faile. 2. The *kingdome of Glory*, the one part of the meaning of the *Kingdome of Heaven*, is not contradistinguished to a *particular Congregation*, but to the generall *visible Church* on Earth, opposed to the *World* by your selfe, The *Keyes*, p. 2. [*On Earth, that is (say you) in the Church on Earth, for he gave him no power to bind in the World.*] 3. That Church was there meant (say you, the way p. 1.) whereof *Peter* was one: But *Peter* was not a member of such a *particular congregation*; for there was none such extant, when *Christ* spake these words to *Peter*. 4. You say againe, it was that Church unto which *Peter* or any offended brother might tell the offence, and have it censured: But that was never done in a Church of Saints, Beleevers, without officers; neither was the

Church

*church* of *Corinth*, such a church as you described before; for that had *Officers*, who authoritatively might censure the incestuous person, yet you joine them both together. 5. It was (say you) a *Church*, who all met in one place for the administration of the *Ordinances* of Christ: But the *Ordinances* of Christ are not to be found, much lesse administered in a *Church* of Beleevers, without *Officers*. 6. When you say, *Christ committed the Keyes to the Church*, that is, a particular Congregation; you must meane it either *Subjective*, or *Objective*: If you meane it in the latter sense, That the *Keyes* are committed to the Church, as the *object* of the exercise of the *Keyes*, that is, for the *use* and *good* of the Church, you say true, but nothing to the purpose. In this sense, the *Keyes* are given, first and more immediately to the *invisible mysticall Church* (*All are yours, whether Paul, &c.*) then to the generall *visible Church*, for their sakes: and then to the particular *Congregation*, as a part or member of that generall *visible Church*. But if you meane it in the former sense, (as you doe and must, or else you *equivocate* with us from the beginning, and throughout your whole Booke) you fall into that *extreme* of the *Brownists*, which you so labour to avoid: For to take the *Church*, in *Mat. 16.* for a particular *Congregation* of Beleevers, without *Officers*, is a new, and strange, and false glosse, maintained by none but *Brownists*, and such like *Separatists*. To conclude, The *Church* of which our Saviour speaks, is called here, the *Kingdome of Heaven* (on Earth:) But a particular *Congregation* of Beleevers is never called the *Kingdome of Heaven*; being but a member or corporation of that *Kingdome*. It were as improper to call a *congregation* Christs Kingdome, as to call *London*, the Kingdome of *England*; yet so your party speake sometimes. This I thought good to note, to cleare the way, for the better



understanding of that which followes: And now goe on.

2. The next thing to be explicated is, what the *Keyes* of the *Kingdome* be; wherein you resolve us thus: [*The Keyes are the Ordinances of Christ, which he hath instituted to be administered in his Church; as the preaching of the Word, as also the administering of Seales and censures.*] I take what you grant, only I shall animadvert some things. In this *Paragraph*, as you doe clearely lay downe the state of the question: so you doe strongly confute the scope of your whole Booke, which is to give the *people* a share in the power of the *Keyes*, that is, in the government of the Church: which appeares upon these considerations; 1. You say, the *Keyes* are the Ordinances, which Christ hath instituted: But the Ordinances of Christ are given indeed for the Church of Beleevers, that is, for their good and benefit, *objectivè*: But are never in all the Scripture, nor in all Antiquity, said to be given to that Church, *subjectivè*. It sounds ill at first hearing, to say that the *people* have any power to exercise *Ordinances*, of preaching, or administering of Seales or Censures. The power of preaching or administering Sacraments by the people, as none but *Separatists* doe *usurpe*: so your selfe complaine of it *page 6*. And why you should allow them power in *censures*, there is very little reason. 2. You say, the *Keyes* are *Ordinances*, which Christ hath instituted to be administered in his Church: What Church? the Church of Beleevers, a particular Congregation; for so you meane, as was shewed afore: Marke it, to be administered in that Church (*scil.* by Officers instituted for that purpose) not by that Church without Officers. 3. You adde that which to me clearly excludes the *people* of your Church: [*These Keyes are neither sword nor scepter, &c. for they convey not soveraign power, but stewardly & ministeriall.*] Whence thus I argue. The *people* or Congregation

Congregation of Beleevers have no *stewardly*, or *ministeriall* power over themselves; *ergo*, they have nothing to doe with the power of the Keyes: They are not as *Hilkiah* was, whose Office was *over the house*, *Isa. 22. 15, 22.* nor *Stewards* in the house, as he was, *Gen. 43. 19.* nor as those are, who are spoken of, *1 Cor. 4. 1, 2. Stewards of the mysteries of God.* But you adde a clause to draw in the people, saying, [*This power (to open and shut the gates of Heaven) lyeth partly in their spirituall calling (whether it be their Office, or their place and order in the Church, &c.)*] I suppose the word *calling*, should be taken here of a *speciall calling*, or *office*, as we use to call it: which againe, would exclude the people from any power in the *Keyes*, as having no *office* in the Church: But you adde, by way of explication of your owne sense: [*Whether it be their Office, or their place and order in the Church*] on purpose to steale in the *interest* of the people, in some share of the *Keyes*: But if *place & order* in the Church, give the people out of office, any power in the *Keyes*, that is, the Ordinances, (so you say again) then may *women & children* claim an interest in those *Keyes*; for they have a *place and Order* in the Church as well as men; which yet you would seeme to deny: But let me professe at first, what I shall make good from your selfe hereafter, I see not, but *women and children* may challenge a great part of that power of the *Keyes*, w<sup>ch</sup> you give to the *Brethren*.

3. Concerning the third: What are the *Acts* of the *Keyes*, and the fourth, what is the *subject*, to be bound and loosed, I shall not contend with you. The fifth, *To whom the power of the Keyes is given*, requires a more serious consideration, as being the very foundation of all your new *Fabrick*, which stands or falls with it. The Text is expresse: [*To thee (Simon Peter) will I give the Keyes, &c.*] in a cleare contradiction to the *Church* before mentioned: upon this rock



(of thy confession) will I build my *Church* : which you take for a *particular congregation*, (though by a great mistake, as was shewed above.) But let it be granted for the present to be so ; then the words in all cleare construction run thus : I will build my *Church*, the *particular congregation*, upon that rocke ; and I will give the *Keyes* of that *Church* (called the *Kingdome of Heaven*, and so by you interpreted) to thee *Peter*, and to such *Officers* as thou art : Otherwise he would have said : On this rocke will I build my *Church*, and I will give unto it the *Keyes* of the *Kingdome of Heaven*, that is, of the *Church* it selfe ; which is scarce a reasonable interpretation of the words. To make way therefore for your great designe, you undertake to resolve that busie question (as you call it,) [*How Peter is to be considered in receiving this power of the Keyes; whether as an Apostle, or as an Elder, or as a Beleever, &c.*] Before I come to consider your answer, I would make bold to put one *ingredient* more into the question ; whether *Peter* was not considered as a *Deacon*, as well as an *Elder*, or *Beleever* : For seeing a *Deacon* is one of the *Officers* of the *New Testament*; (some say *Judas* was *Christs* *Deacon*) and your selfe say, all the *Officers* of the *Church* were virtually in the *Apostles* ; They were *Pastors*, *Teachers*, *Ruling-Elders*, *Deacons*, &c. It may not unfitly be questioned, whether *Peter* did not then represent a *Deacon*, as well as an *Elder* or *Beleever*. And then againe, whether the *Keyes* were not given to *Peter* as a *Deacon*; and why a *Deacon* only is denied any power in the *Keyes*, when beleevers are admitted to have a share therein; seeing a *Deacon* hath power to collect and distribute the *goods* and treasury of the *Church*; I leave these to your consideration, or theirs who shall reply, and come to your answer. To shew your desire of *peace*, and your impartiality in inclining to any party,

The Keyes,

p. 32.

The way, p. 83.

party, you consider (you say) *Peter* in a threefold notion when he received the Keyes [*As an Apostle, Elder, Beleever; so the sense of the words (you say) will be most full, if all the considerations be taken joyntly together.*] The sense indeed is most full to your purpose, but (I thinke) least of all true.\* And you doe beg the question, to say *Peter* received the power of the Keyes, as all these, and in particular, as a Beleever: For of all the senses, the last was least thought on in any age of the Church, till this last, when the *Brownists* and such like stumbled upon it. When Saint *Austin* said, [*Peter received the Keyes in the name of the Church:*] Whether he did mistake the sense of the place or no, you doe utterly mistake him, to draw him to your meaning: For 1. he did not meane your Church, a particular congregation; but either the generall *visible* Church; or the *invisible* mysticall Church. 2. Nor that neither, *subjectivè*, but *objectivè*, that the Keyes were given to *Peter* as an Officer, for the use and benefite of the Church.

\* The power of the Keyes is given to the Church, to *Peter*, not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a profest Beleever; in the name of Beleevers, &c. The way, p. 27. a flat contradiction.

But you proceed to say: [*It appeares Christ gave the power of the Keyes to the Body of the Church, even to the fraternity, with the Presbytery, Mat. 18. 17, 18. When they are met in his Name, and agree together in the censure of an offender.*] But by this place (and your former notion of *Peter* as a Beleever) you may as well inferre, that the Keyes are given to the *Sororetie*, q. d. as to the *Fraternity*, as Beleevers, and as a part of the Body of the Church, which I thinke is flat *Anabaptisme*, worse than *Brownisme*. You know there are some, who deny that, *Mat. 18. 17, 18.* holds forth any censure of excommunication at all: Others that grant it, yet by Church there, understand the Officers of the Church, such as the Apostles were, to whom Christ spake: [*What ye binde, what ye loose, &c.*] You must not therefore beg a foundation to your building,



ding, lest, if it be fetched home, your building fall on your owne head. But you say, [*All agree in this, That no offender is to be excommunicated, but with some concurrence of the congregation; at least, by way 1. of consent to the sentence. 2. of actnall execution of it, by withdrawing themselves from him; and this we conceive is some part of the exercise of the power of the Keyes.*] But truly, this is but the gingling of the Keyes at most, no part of the power of the Keyes: For 1. it belongs to Stewards in a Family, only to exercise the power of the Keyes, to take in, and cast out what servants they please: The rest of the servants heare the Keyes gingle, when they turne the Keyes, but have no part in the exercise of them; no, not so much as by consent, *active* consent, I meane, so that if they consent not, nothing is done; but by a *passive* consent only, as approving what the Steward hath done: If you grant the Fraternity any more, you make them *joynt Stewards* of the Family, the Church, as you shall heare hereafter. Nay, sometimes you seeme to give them no more [*The people discerning and approving the justnesse of the censures before administred by the Elders, they give consent in obedience to the will and rule of Christ*] which is no part of the exercise of the power of the Keyes. For suppose the *censure* be justly administred, and the people deny their consent; shall not a Delinquent be censured unlesse they will consent? If not, they have full power in the Keyes, arising to *authority*, which is the error of the one extreme: If so only as *passively* to consent, its evident, this is no part of the power of the Keyes. 2. For their *withdrawing*, thats much lesse any power in the Keyes. The Steward of a Family having discharged a naughty servant, and turned and locked him out of doores, all the rest of the servants are to *withdraw* from him; but this is not by way of *active* power, but *passive* obedience. Is the *withdrawing* of people

people from a man *outlawed* in civill affaires, any interest in the *Keyes* of Iudicature ? If it be said, except the people consent and *withdraw communion* from a censured person, the censure is in vaine. I answer : If the people should be so rebellious to civill Authority, as not to *withdraw* from an *outlawed* man, nothing were done, the sentence was so farre in vaine. If no man could be gotten to execute a malefactor condemned, the sentence were frustrated in respect of the execution. But doth this inferre, that the people have an interest in the *Keyes* of secular power ? The question is not *de facto*, what the people stubbornly may doe; but whether they ought not to consent and withdraw ; and whether if they doe not, they can challenge any *interest* in the *power of the Keyes*. Againe, if the *Keyes* were given to *Peter* as a *Believer*, I see no reason but women and children may come in and challenge a *power* in the *Keyes*. It suffices not to say (as the Epistolars say, pag. 3.) [*Women and children are excepted by a Statute-Law of Christ, against their enjoyment of any part of this publick power.*] For though they be forbidden to speake in the Congregation, or might by *impotence* (as some say) be excepted in some particulars ; yet there seemes no reason why they should be exempted from that *power* here given to the *Fraternity*, which concernes them as well as men, and they are as well able to exercise it as men ; *viz.* to give a (*passive*) consent, or to withdraw from the party excommunicated ; which they may and must doe as well as men : For as *women* may be offended, so they should in reason have satisfaction, by consenting to the sentence: And as *women* may offend, in keeping company with a brother or sister excommunicated, so they ought to *withdraw* from them: & then if this be any exercise of the power of the *Keyes*, you may heare them *gingle* at the womens girdles ;

C

which



which is an *extreme* beyond the *Brownists*, even downright *Anabaptisticall*. But you give the *Fraternity* more power than this hereafter, there we shall consider it. Hitherto you have given them nothing, but what is common to them with *women*.



## CHAP. II.

### *Of the distribution of the Keyes.*



On first lay downe the *ordinary Distribution of the Keyes*, and then except against it, as defective in foure things.

1. [*That any key of the kingdome of heauen should be left without power ; for the key of knowledge is contradiistinguished from a key of power.*]

To this I answer : It may be this *distribution* is not every way exact and perfect, yet I thinke yours is rather worse : And your exception fals upon your owne distribution, a little more remotely. For your key of *Faith*, or knowledge (for you make them both one) is distinguished from the *key of Order* ; which *Order* is either of *power*, or *authority*, and so your key of knowledge is left without *power* also. 2. Your *key of power* (as you call it) is it selfe left without all power, at least *active* power, being only an *obedientiall* power, to consent and yeeld submission to the will of *Christs*, made knowne by the *Elders*.

2. [*There*

2. [*There wants (say you) an integrall part of the keyes, the key of power or liberty, belonging to the Church it selfe.*] But to this I say: This is so farre from being an integrall part of the keyes, that it is no key at all, no proper power at all, as hath partly been shewed already. A key, in all mens judgement, that ever writ of the power of the Church, carries in the notion of it, a power and authority; properly called, power in government, till now of late; yea, even the *Brownists* themselves make it a key of Authority and Rule in the people: Onely you, to make us beleieve you differ from them, call it a power (improperly called *Authority*, pag. 36.) or a liberty, or a privilege; which was never before called a key, till now: For there are many liberties or privileges belonging to servants in a family, or people in a State; which no man calls a key of power, or a power in the Keyes. And the truth is, you are not constant to your selfe: For sometimes you call it only liberty, &c. sometimes you give the Church, the Brethren, without their Officers, as full power as the Officers themselves have; and as full rule and authority as the *Brownists* give them, as we shall manifest in the sequell.

But you adde; [*Protestant Churches having recovered the liberty of preaching the Gospell, and ministry of the sacraments, have looked no farther, some of them nor discerned the defect of Church power or liberty due unto them in points of discipline.*] To this I say: The errour of the Protestant Churches, was not, that they looked not after the power of discipline for the people; but that they laboured not to recover it for their Elders, letting the Prelates keep quietly the discipline to themselves. But the errour on the other hand was more easie to be fallen into, and more dangerous (which you observe to have followed) [*That others finding themselves wronged (as they did but suppose) in the withholding a key of*  
power,



power which belongs to them, have wrested to themselves an undue power, which belongs not to them, the key of Authority.] True it is, some have done so; for being allowed (by some, perhaps your selfe) the key of power, or liberty in discipline, as you call it, they have wrested, not only the key of knowledge, in preaching and administering Sacraments, which belongs not to them; but also the key of authority, as you speake; And so will your people too ere long, I feare, when they are once possessed a while of the key of power, wrest the key of authority in all; both in preaching, and administering Sacraments, and pronouncing censures, and well they may by your owne grants, as we shall heare anon.

3. A third defect you observe; [*In dividing the Key of Order, from the Key of jurisdiction, of purpose to make way for the power of Chancellors, &c.*] But 1. That might be the error of the distributors, not of the distribution. For the distribution, gives both the keys to the same men. For the same men that had the key of knowledge, had also the key of order and jurisdiction, in the invention of the first founders of that distribution, which after ages divided in practise. And yet, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, &c. some of them at least were Deacons, who were reputed of the Clergy (as they speake) and might preach if they would; and so had both keys in one person, though limited in some particular acts of them. But if our late Deacons were (as some of our brethren have said they were) virtually Presbyters, and needed no new Ordination; then certainly they had the power of jurisdiction, with the power of Order, though limited, by the corruption of the distributors.

2. This defect may chance to fall upon your owne distribution. Doe not you divide the key of Order from the key of jurisdiction in your owne Deacons? You say expressly in these words:

words: [*The Order of Deacons, whereof our Lord spake nothing touching jurisdiction*] I hope you will not say, the Office of a Deacon, falls not under the key of Order; yet, for ought I perceive, you make little account of him in your distribution. 3. You say [*Those Chancellors, &c. were invested with jurisdiction, and more than ministeriall authority, even above those Elders, who labour in Word and Doctrine.*] But doe not you invest the people with as much power and jurisdiction more than ministeriall, even above those Elders, who labour in the word and doctrine, both to open and shut the doores of the Church against them, page 9. besides what you say elsewhere. 4. I would gladly be resolved, whether you doe not divide the key of Order, into a key of power or liberty, and a key of authority, on purpose to make way for the power of the people, as they of old did, for the power of the Chancellors, &c. Lastly, I pray you seriously to consider, whether by this [*sacrilegious breach of Order, investing the people with a key of power, even above those Elders that labour in the Word and Doctrine, to open and shut the doores against them, page 9. (which is the breaking as it were of the files and rankes in an Army; they are your owne words)*] Satan is not like againe to rout and ruine a great part of the liberty and power of Church officers, and the purity of the Churches, and of all the Ordinances of Christ in them.]

4. A fourth defect is, [*That Order is appropriated to the Officers of the Church only: We put a difference between Office and Order.*] We shall speake more fully to this hereafter. All we say for the present is but this: That Office and Order in the strict and Ecclesiasticall sense of the word (Order) have hitherto been taken for the same. And your selfe grant, page 7. [*They may be admitted as aquivalent*] in a right sense.



Let us now consider your owne *Distribution* : [*There is* (say you) *a key of Faith, and a key of Order,*] and you have a Text of Scripture for it, *Col. 2. 5, 6.*

But by *Faith* and *Order* there, the Apostle meanes not the *keyes* of the kingdome of Heaven, as they are understood in this controversie ; but (as I take it) their *Faith* manifested in their *orderly* walking, as becomes Christians professing the Gospell. So that by *Order* there is meant their *morall* orderly walking, as in other duties according to the *Rule* : so in their submission to the *order of government*, or exercise of the *keyes*, in the hands of their Officers. I beleeve no *Interpreter* (but your selfe, and some others of late) ever tooke those words in an *Ecclesiasticall* sense, for the *keyes* delivered unto *Peter*. But we goe on.

[*The key of Faith* (say you) *is the same with the key of knowledge,* Luke 11. 52. *which the Lawyers had taken away.*] But 1. by your favour, the *key of Faith* and *knowledge* are not both one, if you understand it of *justifying Faith*: A man may have much knowledge and no Faith : *Knowledge* may in a sense be said to be the *key of Faith*, as being the *inlet* or *Antecedent* of Faith ; but so *Faith* and *knowledge* are not the same. 2. The *key of knowledge* is one thing, and *knowledge* is another : The *key of knowledge* is the great *Ordinance of preaching* (you said) the *keyes* of the kingdome of Heaven were the *Ordinances* of Christ, as the preaching of the Word (the opening and applying of it, p. 2) &c. But this *key of knowledge* here you speake of, is (you say) common to all *Beleevers* ; but a little before this, you complaine that private Christians had usurped this *key*, to preach the Gospell, &c. page 6, Whereas this *key of knowledge* is peculiar to the *Ministers* of the Gospell : [*The Priests lips keep the key of knowledge,* &c. and *Faith comes by the Word preached.*]

This

This was the *key of knowledge* which the Lawyers had taken away, either by not interpreting, or misinterpreting the Scripture; They could not take away the peoples *knowledge*, much lesse their *Faith*. They might take away the *key*, both of knowledge and Faith, that is, *preaching*, as the *Papists* doe, by locking up the Word in a strange language; and ours lately did, by crying and putting downe *preaching*.

2. Whereas you say: [*They that had the key of knowledge, had power to enter into the kingdome of Heaven, and it may be, to open the doore to others to enter also.*] I answer: The *key* s given to *Peter*, Matth. 16. were not to open the Kingdome of Heaven to himselfe (for that *key*, if a key it was, he had before) but to open it to others, by opening and applying the Word (as you said above) our Saviour speaks of binding and loosing others: *Whose sins ye bind on earth, &c.* and of opening for, and shutting out others, not himselfe. *Keyes* are given to *Stewards*, not properly to let in, or shut out themselves; but by way of *Office*, to let in, or locke out others. Besides, the *key of knowledge* and Faith which you describe here, is common to all *Beleevers*, even *women*; but I beleeve you will not give them a *key* to open and shut heaven to others, that is the *key of preaching*. Then againe, why doe you dislike the former distribution; when you also make one *key* to be the *key of knowledge*, and so leave one of the *keyes* of the Kingdome of Heaven *without power*, contradicting the *key* of Faith or knowledge (for with you they are both one) from the *key of power*, which falls under your *key of Order*: Lastly, whereas you say a faithfull soule by this *key* entreth into a state of grace, and into the fellowship of the Church, &c. You may remember, that by the *Kingdome of Heaven*, which is the Church on Earth, you understand a *particular Congregation*. But a man may have

this.

A priviledge to find an open doore to enter into the fellowship of the Church, p. 11. which is passive, and in plaine sense, one fit to be admitted into the Church. So the Epistolers, p. 2. The key of knowledge hath opened their hearts; that is, I think, preaching.



this *key* of Faith or knowledge, and never enter into your *particular Church*, and so this *key* is given to a man out of the *Church*; and yet you say, the *keyes* are given to the Church, I leave you to consider it. These things hang not well together.

In the next place you come to the *key of Order*; of which you thus write: [*The key of Order, is the power whereby every member of the Church walketh orderly himselfe, according to his place in the Church, and helpeth his brethren to walke orderly also.*] But this is a strange expression of the *key of Order*, never heard of before, too generally and æquivocally spoken: For *Order* may be taken either *morally*, or *Ecclesiastically*; Passively, or Actively. Morally, so it is taken passively, for a *conformity* in carriage, to the *rules* of the word, in *Doctrine*, as well as *discipline*: But *Ecclesiastically*, it is an *Active power*, acting upon others. The very name of a *key*, imports a *power*, intrusted for others good, and not their owne properly. Every one is to *keep Order*, but every one hath not the *key of Order*. *Order* and *Office* in this *Ecclesiasticall* sense are both one. None hath the *key of Order*, but one in *Office*. But your *key of Order* is common to every member of the Church: And that it is no more than *morall* or *passive Order*, your selfe doe seeme to grant, when you say, [*The brethren stand in an Order, even in an orderly subjection, according to the order of the Gospell.*] Every *servant* in a Family, and every man, woman and childe in a corporation stand in such an *order*, and must walke *orderly* themselves, and help others to walke *orderly* also; but will any man say, therefore these have interest in the *keyes* of the Family or Corporation? If every member of a Congregation have this *key of Order*, how and why are women and children excepted? or are they no *members* of the Church?

or

or may they walke disorderly? The instance of Saint Pauls walking orderly, according to the orders of the Iewish Church, manifests the morall sense of the word: For certainly, the *Fraternity* of the Iewes had no power of the Keyes. The meaning was, that Saint Paul by his conformity to some Iewish Ceremonies, should manifest, that he did not absolutely oppose the Rites of the Iewish Church, not that he had any power of the *Keyes* of the government of that Church. Surely the *Iewes* were bound all of them to withdraw from every brother that walked disorderly; yet did not beleeve that that was any part of the exercise of the *key of Order*. No more was it in those of *Theffalonica*; when they did warne the unruly, or withdraw from him that walked disorderly: And this *Key of Order*, if a Key it were, was common not only to *Elders* and *Brethren*, as you say, but even to women and children, as I said afore.

[Of Order (you say) there be 2. Keyes; one of power or interest, another of Authority or Rule; The first of these is called in Scripture, Liberty, &c.]

Before I examine the particulars, I shall note some few things: 1. How modest error is at first: Here it is first called power, mollified by interest, and then by liberty, after by privilege; all which are rather passive than active; but afterwards it is called *ἐξουσία*, power, which though it sometimes signifies a privilege, honour, or dignity, *Iohn* 1. 12. in a passive construction, as given and received; yet when it relates to Government, or a power of the *Keyes*, civilly, it then is taken actively, and signifies Authority, *Romanes* 13. 1. But page 36. it is called, *ἐξουσία*, which properly, (though you say otherwise, signifies Authority; [Authority, after a sort, may be acknowledged in the people.] And the acts there (and elsewhere) given to the people, some of them



at least ; as [*joyning in Censures, and in determination of Synodall acts, &c.*] called, [*a great stroke or power in ordering Church affaires ;*] amounts almost to as full authority, as the Elders have any. 2. Another thing I note is, that this power, interest, priviledge of the people, &c. was never called a *Key*, till some new *Lock smiths* made this new *pick-locke* of the power of Church-Officers. For what is all that is given them, if no more than is their due) to the government of the Church ? In a Family, in a Corporation (I say it againe) the servants and Citizens have some *priviledges* and interests, who yet have no *stroke in ordering of the Keyes*, either of Family, or City. 3. I desire to know, under which of the parts of this distribution doth the *Deacon* fall. There be 2. *Keyes of Order* ; of power or interest ; of Authority or Rule. Now a *Deacon*, qua *Deacon*, falls under neither of these : Not the first, for so he is considered only as a *Believer* : Not the second, for so he is denied *jurisdiction*, as we heard afore. If you say he falls under the *Key of Order*, as an Officer ; yet then you divide the *Key of Order* from the *Key of jurisdiction*, (which you blamed in the other distribution) and levell the *Deacon* an *Officer*, with people no Officers. We should now come to the particulars of the power, or interest of the *Brethren* : They have a *liberty* (say you) in many things ; but they are more fully laid downe in Chapter 4. there we shall consider them : Only now we shall consider the prooffe of this *power of the people*, out of the Scripture : Your Text is, *Gal. 5. 13. Brethren, you have been called unto Liberty, &c.*] This Text (under favour) is miserably mistaken ; and that not in mine only, but in the judgement of all *Interpreters* ; which you knowing, had rather appeale to the *Context*, than to the *Commentators*. I shall follow you at your owne weapon ; Your *Strength* lyes in the

the word *Liberty*. [*They have a power and liberty, to wit, to joyne with the sounder part of the Presbytery in casting them out, &c.*] But I shall appeale the Apostle himselfe to be Iudge between us: In the first verse of this Chapter he uses the same word, [*Stand fast in the Liberty &c.*] where it is without all controversie, understood of their *liberty*, or *freedome from the Ceremoniall Law*; called there, the *yoke of bondage*, which some false teachers would impose upon their necks. Now that the Apostle speaking still of the same matter, should use the same word in so different a sense, is no wayes probable. Nay secondly, in the 11. verse, the Apostle sayes: [*If I yet preach circumcision, why doe I yet suffer persecution, &c.*] And then ver. 13. comes in againe with this: [*Brethren you are called unto Liberty, &c.*] viz. from that Law of *Circumcision*, and the like, not to the *liberty* by you pretended; [*To chuse Officers, or to joyne in Censures, &c.*] though these were granted to them, yet not in this place: And your glosse is very far fetcht and improvable. [*I would they were cut off that trouble you, where (say you) he declares what censure he wishes against those that troubled them, viz. cut off, to wit, by excommunication.* Obj. But what power have we to cut them off? The Apostle answers: *They have a power and liberty, to wit, to joyne with the sounder part of the Presbytery in casting them out: For (saith he) you are called unto Liberty.*] There is not one word of this glosse in the Text. And if there were any such power, the people have full power given themselves to cut them off; for here is not one word of joyning with a *Presbytery*. See againe, v. 16. where the Apostle resumes his exhortation, ver. 13. [*Use not your liberty as an occasion unto the flesh; saying, I say then, walke in the spirit, and you shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh.*] Which makes it evident, that the Apostle



chiefly exhorts *ad bonos mores*, though he touch other things by the bye, but *discipline* is least of all intended. And lest they should use their *liberty* from those legall and ceremoniall yokes, to contention or licentiousnesse, he cautions against it, *v. 13, 16.* [*Carnall contention is indeed (as you say) an usuall disease of popular liberty;*] which I feare, you and your partners too much foment, by giving the people this power and liberty, which you so much talke of; and by *gingling* these *Keyes* in the eares of the *people*, have almost made them wilde; not only one against another, but against their *Elders* or *Governours* also. And no marvell, when you grant them so much power [*As to open a doore of entrance to the Ministers Calling: so to shut the doore of entrance against them in some cases; page. 9.*] much more than which the *Brownists* doe not grant them. And so much of the *pick-locke of Order.*

*The Key of Authority is a morall power, in a superiour order or state, binding or releasing an inferiour in point of subjection.*] To this I say; 1. To call *Authority* a morall power, is very improper: For every single Pastor, (yea, perhaps brother,) hath a morall power to bind and release, not only an inferiour, but a superiour also, in point of subjection, by propounding the commands of God. You might rather have called it, a *juridicall*, or *Ecclesiasticall* power, and that without any danger, seeing you reserve this power to the Officers or superiours in Order. But 2. you speake too confusedly: For the people have a power to joyne with the Officers in the censures, that is, in binding and releasing, as you say *page 14.* [*The whole Church may be said to binde and loose;*] Nay, to open and shut the doores against their Ministers, who are their superiours; and so *Authority* is a morall power in inferiours also. And *page 12.* you say the people have

have a power, [*To prevent the tyranny, and Oligarchy, and exorbitance of the Elders.*] Surely this must be by a *negative voice*, and thats more than *liberty*, even full *authority*; and being by inferiours, is flatly against your owne definition. Furthermore, as you say [*the Brethren with the Elders have power to open and shut, &c.*] So you say, [*the Elders with the Brethren doe bind and release,*] page 10. So it seemes, as the Brethren can doe nothing without the Elders: so the Elders can doe nothing without the Brethren, as the Epistolers say expressely. page 4. And who would not now conclude, that the *liberty* is equall in both; or rather, the *authority* is the same in both, and what say the Brownists more?

And now I thinke you cannot truly say, you have received this distribution of the *Keyes* from the Scripture, nor yet from *antiquity*; though you would faine have us believe, you would not sticke upon the former distribution, if the words be rightly explained. As how? 1. [*Let them (say you) allow some spirituall power to the Key of knowledge, though not a Church power.*] But have you not all this while been speaking of the *Keyes* of the Kingdome of Heaven, that is, the Church; and now is the power of the *Key of knowledge*, no Church power? Again, have not you your selfe taken away from the *Key of knowledge*, not only Church power, but all power whatever, by contradistinguishing it to the *Key of power*? 3. Is that *Key*, whereby he that hath it, [*not on'y enters himselfe into the Kingdome of Heaven, but also opens the doore for others to enter, no Church power?*]

You adde secondly, [*Let them put in a Key of liberty, as well as of authority into Church power.*] But both these are but *one Key*, or nothing, as we have said; Nothing indeed to purpose, if both these must consent, or nothing is done,



as you and the Brethren assert. 3. [Let them not (say you) divide from the Key of Order or Office, the Key of jurisdiction; for Christ hath given no jurisdiction, but to whom he hath given Office.] But 1. Christ (it seemes) hath divided the Key of Office, from the Key of jurisdiction; for hee hath given no jurisdiction to *Deacons*. 2. You should have said, and your scope required it, Christ hath given to none the Key of Order or Office, but to whom he hath given the Key of jurisdiction, but that had contradicted your selfe in the instance of *Deacons*: [Concerning whom (say you) our Lord spake nothing of jurisdiction, page 6.] Now is it not as strange, that there should be an Office in the Church, without some jurisdiction; As that there should among the Prelates, be jurisdiction without an Office, at least, instituted by Christ: as it was in Chancellors, Commissaries, &c. Nay, is it not as strange that there should be *Authority*, that is, jurisdiction, to binde and loose, in those that have no Office at all; as there is in the people in your way; as that there should be an Office without jurisdiction? And now I leave you to consider, whether of these Distributions is most consentaneous to the truth.

CHAP.



# CHAP. III.

## Of the Subject of the Key of Knowledge and Order.



YOu first tell us in generall; [*That as the Keyes be divers, so are the Subjects to whom they are committed divers.*] But this is very doubtfull and disputable; because at first, all the Keyes were given to Peter at once, and therefore one subject may possesse them all: And sure they all meet in Pastors, every one of them hath all the Keyes; of knowledge and of power; of Order and jurisdiction, according to the old distribution, and perhaps in yours also. As the Apostles had all the Keyes by your confession; [*They might exhort as Pastors, teach as Teachers, rule as Rulers, receive and distribute the oblation of the Church, as Deacons:*] So, I see no reason, but every Minister of the Gospell hath virtually in him all the same power and Offices: And if they be since divided into more hands, for ease and Order, yet the subject is primarily but one; and for the diversity of subjects of the Keyes, it concerns them who plead it, to make it good by Scripture. Upon this reason, there are some, who as they question the Office of a ruling Elder, having it no direct or expresse instituted for it in the Scripture. 2. No instance of any such, that

The Keyes,  
p. 32.



that ruled, and were not also *Pastors*. 3. Nor doe you say, That *Peter* received the *Keyes* as a *ruled Elder*, but as a *Pastor*: so they would not yeeld the Office of the *Deacon*, but that they finde expresse instituted of it afterwards by the *Apostles*. But I will not multiply controversies, but come to your particulars.

1. [*The Key of knowledge (or which is all one, the Key of faith) belongeth to all the faithfull, whether joyned to any particular Church or no.*] But 1. Then one of the *Keyes* of the Kingdome of Heaven belongs to *women*, yea to *Infidels*; When God gives them *Faith*, [*he gives them a Key to receive Christ, and to find an open doore to enter into the fellowship of the Church.*] But sure the *Apostle Peter* did not represent *Infidels* when the *Keyes* were committed to him. 2. The *Keyes* (you said) were given to the Church; but now you say, they are given to some before they enter into the Church. But I pray, Sir, is not he entred into the Church, who hath received Christ, and makes profession of his faith? Yes, you may say, into the *mysticall Church*, but not into a *particular church-fellowship*. I answer, he is entred also into the generall *visible Church*, by profession of his faith; to which Church, we thinke, the *Keyes* were first given, and after, to the particular Church. But you have so long dreamed of a *particular Church*, to be the first and only instituted Church, that you seeme to forget the *visible generall Church*, and indeed, to call it a *Chimera*. This, we thinke, you learned from your Cousins, if not your Brethren, the *Brownists*. Heretofore, in Scripture language, so soone as men beleevd, and professed their faith, they were said, to be added to the Church, not to a *particular Congregation* (for so some were never added, for ought we know, as the *Eunuch*, and some others) but to the generall *visible Church*. And I pray, what *Key* was it that opened

opened the doore to enter them into the Church ? Was it the *key* of their owne particular *knowledge* or Faith ? or the *key of preaching*, viz. the *key of knowledge* in the Ministers of the Gospell, and not in themselves ? You say here (which is the truth) that [*they find an open doore to enter into the fellowship of the Church:*] which is *passively*, to be capable to be admitted into the Church, and not *actively*, to open the doore to themselves.

2. [*The Key of Order, belongeth to all such as are in Church order, whether Elders or Brethren.*] But this is doubtfully spoken in a double respect: 1. What you meane by *Order* as afore. If *Order* and *Office* be all one (as you seemed to yeeld) then the *key of Order* belongs not to the Brethren at all, but to the *Elders*, who are in office. If *Order* be taken for *orderly carriage*, or, (as you your selfe speak in this very Paragraph) For [*orderly subjection, according to the order of the Gospell*] it is just nothing to the power of the *Keyes*: For *keyes* imply an active power, orderly subjection is morally passive. 2. It is also doubtfull, what is meant by *Church* in this place: If it be taken for the generall *visible Church*, that hath nothing to doe with the power of the *keyes*, which are committed (say you) to the *particular Church*: If for the *particular Congregation*, it is then doubtfull still. For it may be asked, what power have the Brethren in *Church Order*, in the *keyes of Order*, more than one not yet in *Church Order*? Your selfe speake confusedly here, in my judgement, when you say; [*Every faithfull soule that hath received a key of knowledge* (you should rather say, knowledge, by the key of preaching) *is bound to watch over his Neighbours soule, as his owne, &c. non ratione ordinis sed in tanto charitatis*; Not by vertue of a state or order which he is in (sill in Church-fellowship) but as of common Christian love and charity, one in Church-

E

Order,



*Order, is bound to doe it in both respects, &c.*] But 1. A Christian of no particular Church as yet, is in a *Church Order*, with respect to the generall visible Church, (or else what differs he from an Infidell?) and so is bound to watch over his Neighbour, not only by vertue of common charity, but of that *Christian Order*, wherein he stands. 2. Nay, an Infidell is bound, *in tuitu charitatis*, by vertue of common naturall love and charity, to watch over, and admonish his brother: and is a Christian (not yet in *Church Order*, as you call it) bound no more than he, to watch over his brother? If he be, (as he is, by a nearer relation unto the mysticall body, and visible Church of Christ) then he is to doe it, by vertue of his Order, or state of Christianity: If he be not, what differs he from an Infidell? It was a morall Law, *Lev. 19. 18.* [*Thou shalt not hate thy brother, but rebuke him, &c.*] Which Cain despised, when he said, [*Am I my brothers keeper?*] Surely it is want of naturall charity, not to watch over a brother, that is not in *Church Order* as you meane it. And it is not becomming a Christian to say: [*A Christian in Church Order is not to watch over a brother not in Church Order, ratione ordinis, but only in tuitu charitatis:*] He is bound to doe so for an Infidell, and is he bound no more to a Christian? Suppose one in your *Church Order*, see a Christian not in *Church Order*, walke unorderly; is he not bound to admonish him, by that royall Law of Church Order, *Mat. 18. 1.* And if he will not heare him, to take two or three more; and if he will not heare them, to tell it to the Church; and afterwards, to walke towards him, as God directs the Church to order it? Hath Christ ordained no better remedy to reclaime a Christian, not in *Church Order*, than to reclaime an Infidell? But further: An Officer, or one in a superiour Order, by reason of his office, is bound to watch over

over his brothers soule, not only *in iure charitatis*, but also *ratione ordinis*. Is a brother bound as much as he? or he no more then a brother out of *office*? Again, a *Deacon* is in a superiour Order, by reason of his *office* (as you speake here of *Elders*) in what different respect is he bound to watch over his brother: no otherwise then a brother out of *office*? Truly then it is all one in your way, to be in an *office*, and out of *office*. And this is the way to banish, if not Christian, yet *naturall charity* out of the Church: And it is observable, that since this *new Church-fellowship*, and *Church covenant* hath been set up, *charity* is growne very cold, and some of them have been heard to professe [*they had nothing to doe with an offender, nor of their owne particular Church-communion.*] And doe indeed account all nor of their way, little better than *Infidels*, or as they speake *without*; and in a manner say with *Cain*, *Am I my brothers keeper*? Never was there so little *charity*, so much scorn and contempt of all not in their owne way, as is found in them that professe themselves the only people, that have found *the way of Christ*, though in severall *Sections*.



# CHAP. IV.

## Of the Subject of Church-Liberty.



*This Key is given to the Brethren of the Church; for so saith the Apostle, Gal. 5. 13. Brethren you are called into liberty.* [Concerning the vindication of that Text enough hath been said above. Be-



fore you come to the particulars of their *liberties*, you *Rhetoricate* a little, to make it more passable. [*As in the commonwealth, the welfare of it stands in the due ballancing of the liberties or priviledges of the people, and the authority of the Magistrate: so in the Church, the safety of it is in the right ordering of the priviledges of the Brethren, and the ministeriall authority of the Elders.*] All this is granted: But the right *ballancing* of either, lyes not in the multitude of the people, as having any immediate influence into the government of Church or State: For then the government of both were *Democraticall*. But as in our State, the *ballancing* of the priviledges of the people, and the authority of the Magistrate supreme, lyes in the authority of the *Parliament*; where there are *Knights* and *Burgessees* representing the people: so, I thinke it is in the Church, the ballancing of the *Brethrens priviledges*, and the *Ministers authority*, seemes to lye in the *Ruling-Elders*, who are the representatives of the people. But take away this *ballast* or poise of the government, and it will be either *absolutely Monarchicall*, and so easily *Tyrannicall*, or else *Democraticall*, and so lyable to *Anarchy* and confusion, as experience shewes us, in the *Papall* and *Episcopall* tyranny, and the *Separatists Anarchy*; the two extremes before observed. But let us take a view of the particulars. Their *Liberties* are,

1. [*To chuse their owne Officers: so Acts 1. and 6. and 14.*] In generall I answer thus: The *election* of the people, was no more but a designation, or propounding the persons, and presenting them to the Apostles, not by way of *vote* or *suffrage*, but by way of desire, if they were found fit, to have one or some of them ordained. But this is little or nothing to the *power of the Keyes*. That place *Acts 1.* was an *extraordinary case*, wherein the people had little or no hand:

For 1.

For 1. they were confined to some sort of men, that had conversed with our Saviour. 2. They propounded two, it was not in their power so much as to *nominate* the particular man. 3. The Lord himselfe determined it, and not the Apostles, much lesse the people; As for that word, *οὐκ ἐκείνησαν*, stood upon, it cannot be properly taken, as if they by their *votes* or suffrages, had constituted or ordained *Matthias* to be an Apostle, but barely thus: Seeing God had chosen and ordained him, they accepted him by an *orderly subjection* to the revealed will of Christ. For the second, *Acts 6*. It was expedient, that the people should at least have the *nomination* of their *Deacons*, because better knowne to them, and so better to be trusted with their owne stocke. But they did but *nominate* or present the men, they did not *ordaine* so much as a *Deacon*; [*Looke you out seven men, whom we (marke it) may appoint, or ordaine to this businesse.*] It is never found in all the *New Testament*, that ever the people *ordained* or imposed hands upon any *Officer*; which makes me wonder at the *liberty* taken by *Separatists*, and allowed and practised by your self; [*That the Church or Brethren without Officers, may not only elect, but ordaine and impose hands upon their highest Officers.*] The way, p. 41. As for the third place, *Acts 14. 23*. The word cannot be well rendred: [*They ordained them Elders, chosen by lifting up of hands:*] For it is not to be referred to the people, but to *Paul* and *Barnabas*: who surely did not ordaine *Elders* by *lifting up*, but by *laying on* of hands. And so taken, it excludes the people; for the Substantive to *καταστήσαντες*, is *Paul* and *Barnabas*: If they chole the *Elders* by lifting up of hands, then the people are excepted, not only from *ordination* of their *Officers*, but from *election* too, by this Text. But further: some of your *Brethren* hold, that *election* is the chiefeest peece of a Mini-



sters calling, and *ordination*, but a complement to the *solemnity* of it : And if so, the *people* doe ordaine them as well as elect, and thats more then a *liberty*, even as full *authority* as the *Brownists* give to the people : Your selfe doe acknowledge some where, that [*Ordination is a worke of Rule.*]

The way, p. 48.

Ibid. 45.

The Keyes, p. 8. and often.

Ordination & jurisdiction

pertaine indifferently to all the Presbyters.

The way, p. 49

And yet you say also, [*That the Brethren may ordaine their Officers;*] Therefore the people have more than a *key of liberty*, they have a *key of rule and authority*; which yet againe you doe reserve as *proper to the Elders*. Consider how you can reconcile the contradictions. That the people have a *liberty*, justly to except, or rationally, to approve of their *Officers*, is granted; but this is (I still say) nothing to the *power of the Keyes*, which consists in *Ordination* of Officers chosen, not in the *election* of Officers to be ordained.

2. The second *liberty* of the people is, [*To send out messengers for the publicke service of the Church, Phil. 2. 25.*] This may be granted a *liberty*, but nothing to the *power of the keyes*: People may assent to, or approve of the reasonable choice of *messengers* to be sent forth, just as poore *Cottiers* in the Countrey, that have no *votes* in the election of their *Knights* and *Burgesses*, have yet a consent and approbation to send them to the *Parliament*.

3. A third *Liberty*: [*To accept against such as offer themselves to communion, or unto the seales of it, Acts 9. 26.*] This is nothing more to the *power of the keyes*, than the former. Any *woman* may in a *scandall*, except against any that offers to partake of the *Sacrament*, by way of information to the Officers; yet hath no interest in the *keyes*.

4. A fourth: [*To jayne with the Elders, in inquiring, hearing, judging of publick scandalls, so as to bind notorious offenders under censures, and to forgive the penitents.*] If this be not equivocally spoken, it is certainly more then a *liberty*.

That

That they may enquire for their own satisfaction, and heare by way of presence, is a *liberty* not to be denied. But if you meane any more, it is more then a *liberty*, an act of *rule* and *authority*. Heare your owne words, spoken with respect to *Bishops*, but will better fit our purpose : [*If the Holy-Ghost* The way, p. 48. *had appointed the people to any share in the keyes, he would have appointed them also some eminent worke. But what shall that be ? Shall it be Ordination ? Why that is a worke of Rule: Or shall it be hearing accusations against Elders, and censuring them accordingly ? Why that is a worke of Rule also.*] Let me adde, shall it be judging of publick scandals, so as to bind notorious offenders under censure ? Why, that is a worke of *Rule* also. And consider now, whether they have not a *key of authority*, as full as the *Elders* themselves. If you meane a judgement of discretion only, which all the multitude have at an *Affizes*, it is just nothing to the purpose ; a stranger, none of the Congregation, a woman, an heathen may doe as much. But you say, [*The Apostle alloweth to all the Brethren, a power to judge them that are within, 1 Cor. 5. 22.*] But either this is fallacious ; There was a power in the Church of *Corinth*, to judge those within ; *ergo*, this power was in the people, or else it is false, if meant of *authoritative* judgement ; or if only a judgement of *discretion*, it is quite besides the question. But you fearing an objection, prevent it, to judge is an act of *Rule*, which is proper to the *Elders* : you answer, [*There is a judgement of discretion ; As in the Jury it is an act of their popular liberty, in the Judge an act of judicall authority.*] To this I have many things to say : 1. A judgement of *discretion* will not serve your turne ; for that (as I said) is common to all the people at an *Affizes* ; and that is common to *women*, and *heathens*, if present, at your Consistories ; and if this be all, what difference is there between



between the judgement of a *woman*, an *beast*, and of one of your *Church-members*. 2. The judgement of the *Jury* is indeed an act of *popular liberty* ; but not of their *liberty*, more than of those that are not of the *Jury*. For I aske, why are not all the rest of the people, whom it concernes as much as those twelve men of the *Jury*, admitted to the same judgement with them ? Are not they wronged in point of *popular liberty* ? would not you say, [*The Brethren not admitted to the hearing and judging of an offender, were wronged, if only twelve of the Congregation were designed to heare and judge him.*] 3. The judgement of the *Jury*, is more than of *discretion* (so all by-standers judge) even of *authority*, in some degree and kind, though not *complete* : For they *condemne*, or *acquit* the party, which all the rest together cannot doe. 4. The *Judge*, I take it, may not *condemne* who they *acquit*, nor *acquit* whom they *condemne*, (except by a speciall *indulgence*) and thats farre more than a judgement of *discretion* in the *Jury*. If it be so with the Brethren here (as the *Epistolers* say it is) certainly they have more than a judgement of *discretion* : But your selfe say as much ; you give the Brethren, not only joyned with their *Elders*, but without any Officers at all, full power to censure offenders : Remember your owne words ; [*As for mutuall instruction, and admission, election, and ordination of officers, opening the doores of the Church, by admission of members, and shutting the same by Church-censures : These things they may doe (if need be) without Officers : yea, and if all their Officers were found culpable, either in hereticall doctrine, or scandalous crime, yet the Church hath lawfull authority to proceed to the censure of them all.*] If this be not as full or more *authority* than the *Elders* have over all the Brethren, I professe, I understand nothing in this controversie : yet this I understand, that you  
speake

In our native  
 Countrey, the  
 Iudge dispenses  
 no sentence, but according  
 to the verdict of the  
 Jury, &c. The  
 way, p. 102.

The way, p.  
 45, 101.

speake cleare otherwise sometimes ; denying the *Brethren* any *rule or authority*, reserving it only to the *Elders* : As if you meant no more, but that the people did but yeeld consent to the judgement of their *Elders*, by *obedience* to the will of Christ, and many such like words. 5. But to the point in hand : The *Jury* then doth not represent the *Brethren*, but the *Ruling Elders* ; which *ruling Elders* stand in stead of all the *Brethren*, as the *Jury* doth in stead of all the *people* ; and so the *priviledge* of the people is saved. Otherwise, all the *people* should be of the *Jury*, as all the *Congregation* are allowed by you, and others, to be *Judges* of the offender. And the truth is, it is a *liberty* or *priviledge* to the party that is arraigned, that he may be judged by his *Peeres* ; It is not a *liberty* of the *Jury* : So it is a *priviledge* for any *accused brother*, that he shall be tryed and judged by his *Peeres*, the *ruling Elders* : It is no *priviledge* of the rest of the *Brethren* to be his *Judges* ; as it is no *priviledge* of all the people at the *Assizes*, that they may claime a place in the *Jury*. 6. That which you adde, that there is great difference between the *Judge* and *Jury* : [*For* (say you) *though the Jury have given up their verdict, yet the malefactor is not thereupon legally condemned, much lesse executed, but upon the sentence of the Judge.*] This being rightly paralleld, will make against you: so, though the *ruling-Elders* (representing the people,) give up their votes and judgement ; yet the *party* is not excommunicated, but upon the sentence of the *Pastor*. And indeed, the *Jury* rather seeme to acquit or condemne, than the *Judge* ; he doth but *pronounce* the sentence, as they have adjudged it: so the *ruling-Elders*, being more in number, by *votes* determine the cause, which is pronounced by the *Pastor*, and so the *parallell* is faire and full. But that all the people at the *Assizes* should give up their *verdict*, as well as the *Jury*, is not



in *practise* in the Common-wealth ; and so spoiles the *parallell* of the *votes* of all the *Brethren* in the Church. And yet you persist to say : [*The whole Church may be said to bind and loose, in that they consent and concur with the Elders, both in discerning it to be just, and in declaring their judgement, by lifting up of hands, or by silence, and after, by rejecting the party, &c.*] Just as all the people at an Assizes, may be said to condemne or acquit, because they consent with the *Judge* and *Jury*, both by discerning it to be just, and in declaring their judgement, by lifting up their hands, or by silence, and after, by rejecting the party. But what if the people doe not consent (as discerning it not to be just) nor will reject the party ? Is he then acquitted ? Thus it must be, or it holds not proportion with the case in hand : For if the *Brethren* doe no more but *approve* and *execute* the sentence of the *Presbytery*, this is just nothing to the *power of the keyes*, intended to be given them, and is a meere *passive* priviledge. And that you may see your owne inconstancy, consider what you say elsewhere, page 11. [*The Brethren stand in an Order, even in an orderly subjection, according to the order of the Gospell* page 15. *They give consent, in obedience to the will of Christ*, page 37. *They* (the people) *discerning the light and truth, readily yeeld obedience to their overseers*, page 41. *That they may consent to the judgement and sentence of the Elders.*] Had you kept your selfe constant to these *expressions*, you had both preserved the *truth* of the Gospell, and the *peace* of the Church.

\*That nothing was done without their counsell, implyeth, that nothing was done without their authority. The way, page 31.

And now for a conclusion of this *Section* ; Let me urge you with an argument of your owne, against *Episcopacy*. page 39. [*Hierome sayes, the Churches were governed by the Common-counsell of the Presbyters*]\* The Prelates evasion is, [*By their counsell asked, not followed.*] You answer:

*This*

*This would imply a contradiction to Hieromes words : For in asking their counsell, and not following it, the Bishop should govern the church against their Councel, which is a contradiction.* ] So say I : The Church (say you) is governed by the consent of the *Brethren* : I aske, whether you meane their counsell and consent *asked* only, or followed also. If the later, then the *Brethren* have as full authoriry with the *Elders*, as the *Presbyter*, had with the *Bishop* : If the former, it is a contradiction, to say, The Church is governed by the consent of the *Brethren*, and yet is governed against their consent ; so that the question clearly stated is this : [*Whether the Brethren have such concurrence and consent, as that they have a negative vote, or casting voice :* ] If they have, its that popular *Anarchy*, of you know whom : If not, its nothing to the power of the *Keyes*. Only, let me but remember you what elsewhere you say, concerning the peoples power in government of the Church : [*In case the Officers doe erre, and commit offence, they shall be governed by the whole body of the Brethren ; though otherwise, the Brethren are bound to obey and submit to them in the Lord.* ] How you can reconcile these things I know not.

The way,  
p. 100.

But now you propound a sad question : [*Whether the Church hath power of proceeding to the utmost censure of their whole Presbytery.* ] Before I take your answer, I observe 1. That you might have made the question also, whether the *Presbytery* hath power to proceed to the utmost censure of the Church, and the *Brethren* the *Epistolers*, resolve both negatively, *Epist. p. 4.* 2. That you suppose here, that the Church may proceed to some, though not to the utmost censure of their *Presbytery* ; and that (as you would seeme to deny it in your answer, so) is more than *liberty*, it is a great degree of Authority, not only over one of your members,



but over your Overseers : And now I shall view your answer.

1. *Answer.* [It cannot (say you) be well conceived, that the whole Presbytery should be proceeded against, because some, a strong party perhaps, will side with them, and then the Church ought not to proceed, without consulting with the Synod.]

*Reply.* But 1. this is besides the question, which supposes the whole Presbytery, and the whole Church opposed ; and so your answer may seeme to intimate, that if none did side with them, the Church might proceed against them, and that to the utmost censure ; but only in a *dissension* of the Church, they may not. 2. If in any case, they ought not to proceed, doth not this destroy their *independency*, if they must fly to a *Synod* ? No (say you) they ought only to *consult* the *Synod*. But if the *Synod* have no power to *determine*, and censure, they are still but where they were. What if the Presbytery or Church will not submit to their determination, or *Declaration* ? (for it is no more) what remedy hath the Church against their erring, hereticall, scandalous *Presbytery* ? If the *Synod* have a power of *censure*, then againe you destroy your *Independency* : No ; [The Church may withdraw from them:] So they might before they *consulted* the *Synod* ; nay, they were bound to doe it in your way, without *consulting* the *Synod*. But you may call to mind your former thoughts. In your other Tract, you give them full power [to censure their Officers without any Officers,] as hath more then once been said above.

And thus your second answer is also answered already. You say, [Excommunication is one of the highest acts of Rule, and ergo, cannot be performed but by some Rulers ;] Yet you contradict this flatly, in your other Tract, when you say ; [In case of offence given by an Elder,

or

or by the whole Eldership together, the Church hath Authority, (marke that, Authority, which in this Booke you oft deny) to require satisfaction of them; and if they doe not give due satisfaction, to proceed to censure according to the quality of the offence.] And yet (which is strange, me thinks) here you resolve the cleane contrary: [*The Church cannot excommunicate the whole Presbytery, because they have not received from Christ an office of Rule, without their Officers.*] But now if this reason be good, then on the other side it might seeme reasonable; That the Presbytery might excommunicate the whole Church Apostate, because they have received from Christ an office of Rule, without the Church: No, say you, [*They must tell the Church, and joyne with the Church in that censure.*] But this is to say and unsay: For if the Church must joyne with them, then the Church hath received some peece of an Office of Rule, which was before denyed: If you say, they have not received any Office of Rule, without their Officers; This may imply, that with their Officers they have received an Office of Rule, which all this while you have seemed to deny, allowing them a Liberty, but no Rule or Authority. And whereas you say; [*They must tell the Church, but that cannot be, when the Church is Apostate:*] I rejoyne, this makes it reasonable to me, That there is another Church, to which they must tell the offence, by way of appeale; or else, both an erring Presbytery, or an Apostate Church, have no remedy to recover them, instituted by Christ; and so the Church, a multitude, or a Presbytery, is not so well provided for, as one particular member.

But you have found a remedy; [*The Church wants not liberty to withdraw from them.*] Is not this even tantamount with excommunication? Is it not the execution of that



The Keyes,  
p 17.

sentence, *to withdraw*, especially in your way. *Excommunication* is the contrary to *communion*. Now how doth the Church communicate their Elders? Take your owne words: [*As they set up the Presbytery, by professing their subjection to them in the Lord: so they avoid them* (that is, in sense, excommunicate them) *by professed withdrawing their subjection from them, according to God*] And this is as much as any people doe, or need to doe, to persons *excommunicate*; unlesse you grant them a power to the very Act and decree of *excommunication*; which as you have clearly done in your other Tract, so you doe here, giving them a power more than Ministeriall, even a *Kingly*, and more than a *Kingly* power, when you say; [*They rule the Church, by appointing their owne Officers, and likewise in censuring offenders, not only by their Officers* (which is as much as Kings are wont to doe) *but also by their owne Royall assent, which Kings are not wont to doe, but only in the execution of Nobles.*] Satis pro imperio.

5. *The last Liberty of the Church, is Liberty of communion with other Churches, which is seven wayes exercised, &c.*] To this I say in generall: This is rather *communion of Saints*, than communion of Churches; because in your way, every Church is *independent*, and hath no Church-state, in relation to any, but its owne members. We suppose this *communion* is the liberty or privilege of every Christian, by vertue of his interest in the generall visible Church, and not by any peculiar interest in a particular Congregation. He that is a professed Christian, and baptized, hath a right to all the Ordinances of God, where ever he find them; As of old, he that was a *Citizen of Rome*, or so borne, was a freeman, through all the *Romane Empire*, and enjoyed the privileges of a *Roman*. A Christian is a free *Democrit* in any part

part of the Christian world; [*A Citizen with the Saints, and of the household of God*, Eph. 2. 19.] And this to me seemes reasonable upon these grounds: 1. Because every Christian, not yet in a particular Church, or Congregation, is at liberty to joyne himselfe to any Church, tyed by no obligation to one more than another. 2. Because it is lawfull for any member of a particular Church, upon just reasons to leave that Church, and to joyne himselfe to another, and nothing can hinder his removall or communion with another Church, except he be scandalous, &c. 3. It was the custome of the first times, before Congregations were fixed, to adde them to the visible Church, were their number lesse or greater, and give them communion in all the Ordinances of Christ. 4. Because the whole visible Church is but one City, one Kingdome, though for orders sake, divided into severall Corporations. It is not so in *civill* respects; A *Citizen* of one Corporation, cannot goe and set up *trade* in another, because they have their severall *Charters*: But in the *City* of God, the *Kingdome* of Christ, there is but *one Charter* for all; and no more is required to admit a man a member of any Congregation, but that he professe himselfe a Christian, and live accordingly. Your *New Covenant* to tye men to your *particular Church*, that he may not remove, without a generall leave, will, I feare, prove a snare and a *tyranny*, worse than yet we can imagine.

1. But come we to your particulars. [*First, by way of participation of the Lords Supper, the members of one Church comming to another Church, &c.*] But 1. Why doe you instance in this *Ordinance* only? Have not their children occasionally borne there, a liberty also of *Baptisme*? The rather, because *Baptisme* is not administred with respect to this or that Church, but to the generall visible Church:

Where neither of the parents can claim right to the Lords

Unlesse



The Keyes,  
p 17.

sentence, *to withdraw*, especially in your way. *Excommunication* is the contrary to *communion*. Now how doth the Church communicate their Elders? Take your owne words: [*As they set up the Presbytery, by professing their subjection to them in the Lord: so they avoid them* (that is, in sense, excommunicate them) *by professed withdrawing their subjection from them, according to God*] And this is as much as any people doe, or need to doe, to persons *excommunicate*; unlesse you grant them a power to the very Act and decree of *excommunication*; which as you have clearly done in your other Tract, so you doe here, giving them a power more than Ministeriall, even a *Kingly*, and more than a *Kingly* power, when you say; [*They rule the Church, by appointing their owne Officers, and likewise in censuring offenders, not only by their Officers* (which is as much as Kings are wont to doe) *but also by their owne Royall assent, which Kings are not wont to doe, but only in the execution of Nobles.*] Satis pro imperio.

5. *The last Liberty of the Church, is Liberty of communion with other Churches, which is seven wayes exercised, &c.*] To this I say in generall: This is rather *communion of Saints*, than communion of Churches; because in your way, every Church is *independent*, and hath no Church-state, in relation to any, but its owne members. We suppose this *communion* is the liberty or priviledge of every Christian, by vertue of his interest in the generall visible Church, and not by any peculiar interest in a particular Congregation. He that is a professed Christian, and baptized, hath a right to all the Ordinances of God, where ever he find them; As of old, he that was a *Citizen of Rome*, or so borne, was a freeman, through all the Romane Empire, and enjoyed the priviledges of a *Roman*. A Christian is a *free Denizen* in any  
part

part of the Christian world; [*A Citizen with the Saints, and of the household of God*, Eph. 2. 19.] And this to me seemes reasonable upon these grounds: 1. Because every Christian, not yet in a particular Church, or Congregation, is at liberty to joyne himselfe to any Church, tyed by no obligation to one more than another. 2. Because it is lawfull for any member of a particular Church, upon just reasons to leave that Church, and to joyne himselfe to another, and nothing can hinder his removall or communion with another Church, except he be scandalous, &c. 3. It was the custome of the first times, before Congregations were fixed, to adde them to the visible Church, were their number lesse or greater, and give them communion in all the Ordinances of Christ. 4. Because the whole visible Church is but one City, one Kingdome, though for orders sake, divided into severall Corporations. It is not so in *civill* respects; A *Citizen* of one Corporation, cannot goe and set up *trade* in another, because they have their severall *Charters*: But in the *City* of God, the *Kingdome* of Christ, there is but *one Charter* for all; and no more is required to admit a man a member of any Congregation, but that he professe himselfe a Christian, and live accordingly. Your *New Covenant* to tye men to your *particular Church*, that he may not *remove*, without a generall leave, will, I feare, prove a snare and a *tyranny*, worse than yet we can imagine.

1. But come we to your particulars: [*First, by way of participation of the Lords Supper, the members of one Church comming to another Church, &c.*] But 1. Why doe you instance in this *Ordinance* only? Have not their children occasionally borne there, a liberty also of *Baptisme*? The rather, because *Baptisme* is not administred with respect to this or that Church, but to the generall visible Church:

Where neither of the parents can claime right to the Lords

Unlesse



Supper; there  
their Infants  
cannot claime  
right to Bap-  
tisme. The  
way, p. 81. Nor  
the childe of  
an excommu-  
nicate person,  
p. 85.

Unlesse you hold, that a man or childe is baptized to no Church, but that particular, and an Infidell to all the rest. Yet some of your brethren will hardly baptize a childe of any, but a member of their owne Church, which is next doore to *Anabaptisme*. 2. I aske by what *power of the keyes*, doe your *Pastors* admit a *member* of another Church, to partake of the *Lords Supper*, in yours? Or in what *relation* doth your *Pastor* stand to that *member* of another Church? You say, *Pastor* and *Church* are relates, and he is a *Pastor* to none but of his owne Church: Either then, to administer the *Lords Supper* to a *member* of another Church, is no *Pastor* ail act, but may be done by a *gifted brother*: Or else, a *Pastor* and his *Church* are not so relates, but that he is a *Pastor* beyond the limits of his owne Congregation, which yet you doe deny. 3. You are also very sparing in granting this *liberty*: For you adde; [*In case, neither himselfe, nor the Church from whence he comes, doe lye under any publicke offence.*] But what if that *party* be free from the guilt of that offence? Shall the innocent suffer for the nocent? what *charity*, what *justice* is in this? 4. But your *reason* I like very well: [*For we receive the Lords Supper, not only as a Seale of our Communion with the Lord Iesus, and with his members in our owne Church, but also in all the Churches of the Saints:*] Whence I inferre, then it is not any *favour* dispensed by you, to a *member* of another Church, but a *dignity* or privilege, common to every member of that *body*, by vertue of that *membership*, and not with respect to his *particular* Church membership. And I pray, is not *Baptisme* also a Seale of our Communion, with all the members of Christs body? Why then may you not admit the *children* of the members of any Church, to be baptized by your *Pastors*, upon just occasion, as well as to admit the *parents* to the  
*Lords*

*Lords Supper* ? Nay further : If the *Sacraments* be Seales of our *communion* with all the members of Christ, why doe you not admit any *true Christian*, and his children, to the *communion* of the *Sacraments*, though they be not as yet admitted members of any particular Congregation ? How dare you deny any *member* of that *Body*, *communion* with its fellow-members, when it hath *union* and *communion* with the *Head* ? Consider it.

2. A second way of your communion of Churches, is, [*By way of recommendation as Paul in the behalfe of Phoebe, &c.*] But this is so farre from being any part of the *power of the Keyes*, that it is a *duty*, which a Church or party owe to any Christian that is godly, not by vertue of any particular Church-membership, but by the common interest of Christianity ; yea, by the common right of *humanity*, even to an honest *Heathen*, according to the ninth Commandement, which requires us, *to beare true witnesse to our brother*, if we be thereto required. The *letters* are only *declarative*, of the good behaviour of the party, occasioned to remove to such a place. Was this (thinke you) a part of the *power of the Keyes*, delivered to *Peter*, and the rest of the Apostles ? Besides, if there be any vertue in these *letters*, to admit a member into *communion*, is there not a like vertue in them, to *excommunicate* one ungodly ? And if these *letters* *dismissory* have power to admit a member of one Church, to be a member of another, without any *new covenanting*, have they not the like power to admit the *Pastor* of one Church, to be a *Pastor* of another Church, without any *new Ordination* ? which yet, I beleeeve, you doe not practise.

3. [*By way of Consultation* ; and 4. *by Congregation into a Synod.* ] But what is all this to the *power of the Keyes* ? If upon *Congregation*, and consultation of other Church-



Officers, there be not a binding power, it is rather a *latch* of a doore, which may be opened and shut at any bodies pleasure, than a *Key* to let in, or locke out with any Authority. But of the power of *Synods* more hereafter.

4. A fifth way is: [*The liberty of giving and receiving mutuall supplies one from another; gifted men, or benevolences, &c.*] I conceive first, these are rather *duties* of common *charity*, than of *Church liberty*, or any *power of the Keyes*: And I desire to know what those *gifted men* were, that the Church of *Antioch* sent to other Countries? Were they not *Apostles*, or *Prophets*, or *Teachers* in Office? Then they were *Pastors* or *Teachers* by Office, before they were sent, before they were elected or ordained by the Churches to which they were sent. Thereupon it followes, that a *Pastor* or *Teacher* (because you may say a *Pastor* relates to his owne flocke) a *Teacher* (so was *Barnabas*, Acts 13. 1.) is a *Teacher* to the *generall visible Church*, not to the *particular Church* only, as you hold. And then againe, a *Teacher*, quâ *Teacher*, may preach to another Church, and convert *Heathens*; and not as a *gifted brother* only, as you sometimes speake.

A sixth way is, [*By way of mutuall admonition, when a publicke offence is found amongst them: One Church may send to admonish another, and if that Church will not heare, take two or three other Churches; and if not heare them, then withdraw &c.*] This admonition is a *duty* of every brother, at least of every Christian, as a Christian, and no *power of the Keyes* at all: And let it be considered, that the place, *Matth. 18. 15, 16.* doth not make the admonition of one or more brethren, any *power of the Keyes*, but a *duty* only concerning every man, in order to the censure of the Church: But if one or more Churches may proceed with a Church-offending,

Those two or three are not considered as a Church-body, but as a sufficient num-

offending, as private persons with an offending brother; why may they not take the third step, as the last remedy, to *excommunicate* her, being obstinate, as the Church doth an obstinate brother? No; [*Because the Churches are all of equall authority*:] But so are all the *members* of a Congregation of equall authority, yet the *whole* may excommunicate him: And if there be as much *Church-communication* between Churches, as there is between *members* of a particular Congregation; I see no reason, why many Churches assembled in a *Synod*, may not as well *excommunicate* an obstinate Church, as a Congregation, a particular *member*. If you deny *excommunication* of a Church, others will (and doe) deny *excommunication* of a member, and say, *non-communication*, or *withdrawing* is as much as can be done. And if you say, the Churches may withdraw *communication*; I demand, first, what is that in effect, but *excommunication*, wanting only a *Synodical Decree*; yet page 25. you say, [*A Synod hath power to determine, to withdraw communion from an offending Church*:] And is it any more in the *excommunication* of an offending brother? They doe but determine all shall withdraw *communication* from him. This is therefore but a meere *Logomachie*.

6. The last way of *Communion of Churches*, is, [*by way of propagation, or multiplication of Churches*:] But 1. This is rather a *division* of Churches, than either *propagation*, or *multiplication*: For these very Churches were before all one Church, now only *divided* into two The Apostles and the first Planters, did not thus *propagate* Churches; but went into places, where no Churches were, no Christians, and there gathered and multiplyed Churches. We have enough of this *division* of Churches, (since your way set up) but little of the *propagation* or *multiplication* Primitive

ber of witnesses, to joyne with a brother offended, &c. agreeing in a duty of brotherly love, &c. The way, p. 53.



tive and Apostolicall. For I pray Sir, tell us, next time you write over, how many Churches have you multiplyed amongst the *Indians* in *New-England*? Not one, that I ever heard of: You have *divided* Churches indeed, from *old England*, but *propagated* none. And our *Brethren* at home, how many Churches have they divided and distracted since their returne, but have *multiplyed* none? If some *new Teachers* should arise in *New England*, and gather (or rather steale) some members out of every of your Congregations, would you call this *multiplication* of Churches, or rather *division*? Had you gone into *New England*, and sent out your *Pastors*, (who are by calling, *spirituall Fathers*) to convert *Indians*, (as was pretended) or our *Brethren* here gone and sent into *Wales*, and other parts, little better than *heathens*, and converted them, and had gathered them into Churches, this had been a *propagation* of Churches indeed. But this they doe not, nor will doe, nor well can doe: For their opinion is, (and yours too in *New England*) that no *Pastor* is a *Pastor* to any, but his *particular Congregation*: so their *Pastors* are only *Nurses* to give sucke, not *spirituall Fathers*, to propagate and beget children to God and his Church. That they leave to every *gifted brother*, to raise up seed to their *Brethren*, and not to themselves. For if once the *children* be borne, and a little growne up, then these (*Fathers in Law*) take them up, or rather *steale* them from them, who have spent their *strength* in begetting, and breeding them, *traveling in paine*, till Christ was formed in them. But if a *Pastor* and flocke be relates, is a *Teacher* so too? They may doe well then to send *Teachers* to beget children for their *Pastors*; lest it be said: [No man in Office hath any skill, or will, or power, so propagate, but only to divide Churches.]

Again, why doe you call this a power of the *Keyes*; for a Church

Church to send out a Congregation (as an *Hive* doth a swarm) when they are too full? This is *their liberty*, not yours. They have power without you, to gather themselves together, and to enter into a Church-way, and to chuse their Officers, and doe all, as well as you had.

Lastly, if *Pastors*, quâ *Pastors*, or *Teachers*, quâ *Teachers*, are tyed to a particular Congregation, then cannot they propagate Churches; only *gifted Brethren* can doe that: And so *gifted Brethren*, not *Pastors* and *Teachers*, are the Successors of the Apostles: We thinke *Pastors* and *Teachers* are Officers to the whole Church, as the Apostles were; You will say, then they are Apostles: First, will you say your *gifted Brethren* are Apostles, because they goe abroad to convert and propagate Churches? Secondly, it followes not; That which made the Apostles differ from the *Pastors*, is delivered by your selfe, to stand in two things:


1. [That an Apostle had in him in all ministeriall power of all the Officers of the Church. 2. That Apostolicall power extended to all Churches as much as to any one.] But withall you

The Keyes,  
p. 32.

say, [That this power conjoynd in them, is now divided by them, amongst all the Churches, and all the Officers of the Churches respectively.] I aske then, what Officer of the Church hath power to plant and propagate Churches? Your *gifted Brethren* are no Officers of the Church: I hope, *Ruling Elders* and *Deacons* are tyed as well to their particular Churches, as the *Pastors* and *Teachers*; ergo, it must fall upon the *Pastors* and *Teachers*, or there is no such thing now, as propagation of Churches. But take once more your owne grant in this Paragraph, where now we are: [Though the Apostles be dead, whose Office it was to plant and gather Churches; yet the worke is not dead, but the same power of the Keyes is left with the Churches in common, &c.] Marke, first,



you call it a *power of the keyes*, to plant and gather Churches, and an *Office* of the Apostles : But this *power* of the Keyes, this *Office* is not bequeathed to *gifted Brethren*, nor to *Ruling-Elders*, or *Deacons* ; *ergo*, it is left to the Pastors or Teachers. Next, you say, the same *power* of the Keyes is left with the Churches in common : You should say, with the Pastors or Teachers of the Church, or with the Churches indeed, but in the hands of her Officers : Otherwise, you make not only the *brethren*, but *sisters* too (according to their measure, as you speake) Fathers and Mothers [*To propagate and enlarge the Kingdome of Christ, throughout all generations, as God shall give opportunity.*] But were it so, yet then much more would it concerne the Pastors and Teachers (the Successors of the Apostles, if they have any at all) to propagate and enlarge the Kingdome of Christ, as God shall give opportunity.



## CHAP. V.

### *Of the Subject of the Key of Authority.*



*The Key of Authority or Rule is committed to the Elders of the Church, and so the Act of Rule is proper to their Office.*] But, me thinks, you should have done well, to distinguish both of Authority and Rule, and also of *Elders*, preaching from those they call *Ruling-Elders* : For Authority and Rule may be distinguished; be-  
cause

cause there is Rule in those that are called *Ruling-Elders*, but not Authority to preach and administer Sacraments : I would not have noted it, but that you confusedly reckon up the *particulars* of Authority and Rule, without distinction, what belongs to one sort of *Elders*, what to another ; As if they did equally belong to both.

1. The first is : [*That which the Elders, who labour in the Word and Doctrine, are to attend unto chiefly, that is, the preaching of the word, and the administration of the Sacraments.*] For the first, [*the preaching of the Word,*] some of your *Brethren* say, that private *gifted Brethren* may prophesye, that is, preach, and others say they may baptize too ; who yet are denyed power in ruling, as being not *Elders*, not Officers, to whom the Act of Ruling is proper : Indeed you seeme to deny *gifted Brethren* power to prophesie publickly ; but your *Prefacers* write, *Magister hic non tenetur*. Yet their owne resolution of the case, and their practise doth not well agree. They say, a *gifted Brother* may [*occasionally preach, not in an ordinary course.*] But we see, they doe it *ordinarily* and constantly ; witnesse all their *Lecturers*, their double and treble beneficed *Lecturers* ; and one who takes a *Benefice*, (but perhaps not the charge of soules, nor administration of *Sacraments*) where he constantly *preaches*. If you say, *They are Elders or Pastors* : I answer, they are so, to their owne *select Congregations*, but they are but as *gifted Brethren* to other *Congregations* ; for their principle is, [*Pastor and flocke are relates.*] which, if it be not a *fine delusion*, let the world judge. We deny not, but *gifted Brethren*, of such abilities as are fit for Office, for learning and judgement, &c. may for *approbation*, exercise their gifts. But we only note the difference of these *Masters* ; and that these of ours are nearer to *Brownisme* ; who by their constant



Christ sent  
me not to bap-  
tize, but to  
preach the  
Gospell.

stant preaching as *gifted Brethren*, countenance and encourage *private members*, supposing themselves gifted sufficiently to preach ordinarily; yea, and to administer the *Seales*, which as it is lesse \* than preaching, so also is *annexed unto preaching*, Mat. 28. as your selfe here speakes, and complaine of this practise, page 6.

2. A second Act of Authority common to the Elders, is, [*They have power to call the Church together.*] 1. You said before, *Rule* was an Act proper to the Office of *Elders*: Now you say it is common, you meane perhaps common to both sorts of Elders: But then you should have explained the difference, or resolved us, whether the *Ruling Elders* have equall power with the *preaching Elders* in this Act. For your instance of the Apostles, calling the Church together, *Acts 6.2.* is but for one sort of Elders, and you bring nothing for the other. 2. Besides, *to call the Church together*, seemes rather a matter of Order, than of Authority: For one *Elder* of either sort, may be deputed to this worke. But if this be proper to *Elders*, what if the *Elders* be all offenders, who shall call the Church together then? Truly, this power seemes first to be in the Church, in your way; who as they had *power* to gather themselves into one Body, without *Officers*, so much more, to call an Assembly of themselves. That of *Joel 2.* for the *Priests*, is weakly alledged: For it appeares not that they were called on, to call an Assembly, (but only to *weep v. 17.*) it was rather the *Magistrates* Act to proclaime a Fast.

3. [*To examine all, members or Officers, before they be received of the Church.*] But this, according to your principles, is spoken to the *whole Church*, and so no proper Act of *Elders*. And expressly above, you made this one part of the *priviledge* or liberty of the people, to *propound* just excep-

tions

tions against such as offer themselves ; and if so, then also to examine them, page 13.

4. A fourth Act of their Rule, is, [*Ordination of Officers.*] But 1. This is too confused: What *Elders* doe you meane? Preaching or Ruling? Have the *Ruling Elders* power of *Ordination* of Pastors and Teachers? This, as it is without all *president* of Scripture, so it is against a Rule: [*The greater is blessed of the lesser;*] which cannot be by the Apostles Divinity. 2. This is no Act proper to the *Elders*, but common to the *Brethren*, by your owne judgement, if your minde be not altered since you writ, *The Way*, p. 50, 51. See it.

5. [*To open the doores of speech and silence in the Assembly.*] But 1. one *Elder* doth this; ergo, one *Elder* hath power and authority, not over the Church only, but over his fellow *Elders* also. 2. You take it from them presently in some cases: [*When the Elders themselves lye under offence, the Brethren have liberty to require satisfaction, &c.*] That is, the Brethren may open the doore, and begin to speake. And still you are confused, not declaring whether this power belongs to either sort of *Elders*, or both alike; especially your instance of the *Rulers* of the Synagogue, seeming to carry it to the *Ruling Elders*.

6. [*To prepare matters before hand for the Church, and to reject causelesse and disorderly complaints, &c.*] But doe not you hold, *Mat.* 18. 17. to speake of the Church of the *Brethren*, with the *Elders*? then that place is impertinently alledged, to prove an Act proper to the *Elders*. 2. Have the *Elders* power to judge a complaint to be causelesse, and to reject it, without the cognizance of the people? why then have they not power to judge a complaint to be just, and to censure it, without their cognizance also? Doe you not



intrench a little too much upon your peoples Liberty?

7. [*The Elders have authority in handling an offence, before the Church, both jus dicere, and sententiam ferre.*] But all this, I thinke the Brownists yeeld, who yet give the chiefe, if not the only power to the people; and give the Elders leave, *sententiam ferre*, to pronounce the sentence, as their mouth and Deputies. And you say: [*They are first to informe the Church, what the Law of Christ is, which is, jus dicere; and then, when the Church discerneth the same, and condescendeth to it, by consent, to give sentence.*] But what if the people discern it not, or condescend not, that the sentence shall passe? Then they may have power, *jus dicere*, which every understanding brother hath, but not *sententiam ferre*: A goodly Authority!

8. [*They have power to dismisse the Church, with a Blessing.*] To this I say little; only I say, it is too confused, what Elders you meane, *preaching or Ruling*? and then, I say, this is but a matter of Order, one only does it, and yet I thinke you will not say, he hath Authority over his fellowes.

9. [*The Elders have power to charge any of the people in private, that they live not inordinately, &c. 2 Thes. 3. 6. &c.*] This is very weakly alleadged by a man of your strength: The Apostle speaks this to all the Brethren, the Thessalonians, yea, it may concerne women sometimes, to warne the unruly, especially being to be done in private; and doe you bring this for the power of your Elders? which sort of Elders doth it concerne to doe this, for neither are mentioned? Againe, the Apostle speaks not of charging or warning at all; but peremptorily bids them withdraw, *v. 6.* and to [*note him by a Letter, and have no company with him, v. 14.*]

10. [*If the Church fall away to blasphemy against Christ, &c.*

&c. and no Synod hoped for, or no help by it ; The Elders have power to withdraw the Disciples from them, and to carry away the Ordinances with them, &c.] But 1. the case is mislaid ; for *Acts 19.9.* the Jewes that there blasphemed, were not of the Church ; but only such as came to heare *Paul* preach, which an Infidell might doe ; but then this was no proper withdrawing, as a power of the Keyes : For what had *Paul* to doe, or the Elders with them that are without. 2. Suppose the whole Church fall away, what shall the Elders doe now ? They may not excommunicate them, you said above ; and if they may withdraw, thats no more power than the Brethren have of the Elders Apostate. 3. How can the Elders carry away the Ordinances from them ? For first the Elders cease to be Elders, when the flocke is separated, and ceases to be their flocke. Secondly, the Brethren may keep the Ordinances with them, and have power in your way, to chuse new Officers, to exercise the Ordinances ; and then what care they for their withdrawing, either themselves or the Ordinances ? 4. It seemes not justifiable, that Elders should withdraw, and carry away the Ordinances from a company of erring Brethren. The Prophets of old did not so, but continued still to preach, though the people were obstinate: For this is the remedy to cure their obstinacy, and so the Apostle directs, *2 Tim. 2. 25, 26.*

In the close of this Chapter, you propound a question: [*If the Elders have this power of Rule, how are they then the servants of the Church?*] You answer by a similitude: [*A Queen may call her servants her mariners, to conduct her over Sea ; yet they being called by her to such an Office, she must not rule them in steering their course, &c.*] If such be the case between the Church and her Elders (as you say it is) I see little or no difference between you and the Brownists ; For they



make the Church a Queen, and the Elders but her servants, called by her to such an *Office*; to exercise the power of the *Keyes* in her name: You say here, [*The Elders rule the Church from Christ, and so from their call; and above, sect. 7. The Church condescending to the information of the Elders, what the Law of Christ is, it is a further act of the Elders power, to give sentence against the offender.*] Just as the *Mariner*, when the *Queene*, who hath called him to that *Office*, tels him she is resolved to goe to such a place, puts her command in *execution*, by steering his course to that place.



## CHAP. VI.

### *Of the Authority of Synods.*

**I**N that you acknowledge *Synods* as an Ordinance of Christ, and set downe the *causes* of assembling Churches into *Synods*, we shall easily agree with you: The maine controverſie is about their *power*. Concerning which you move three questions.

1. 2. What power it is they have received; which you thus resolve: [*Not only to counsell and give light, but also to command and enioyne things to be beleevd and done.*] But this

(as

(as was noted in your Prefacers Epistle) is but an empty grant. For you meane it rather materially, than formally, by any Authority the *Synod* hath to bind them to obedience or censure : Yes, formally (you say) [*from the authority of the Synod, which being an Ordinance of Christ, bindeth the more for the Synods sake.*] But the great scruple is, what kind of Authority this is, whether it differ *specifically* from the power of a single *Pastor*, or of a *Congregationall Presbytery*, or only *gradually*, as a greater *testimony*; for so some of yours understand it : If in this latter sense, I see not how it can be called an *Ordinance* of Christ, or *authority* distinct from the Authority of one single *Pastor* : For he hath Authority *ministerially* to declare and command people, what God commands and declares to be his will, *with all Authority* : And this seemes to be your meaning; for you say [*A truth of the Gospell taught by a Minister, bindeth to faith and obedience, not only because it is Gospell, but also because it is taught by a Minister for his callings sake.*] Now suppose 20, or 40, or more *Pastors* met together, teach and declare a truth of the Gospell; & enjoyne it to their severall Congregations, by way of a *Deeree*; I aske what difference is there between this Authority of theirs, and the Authority of any one of them single? If you say, none but *gradually*, then I say, they have no Authority as a *Synod*, but as *Pastors* : If you say, *specifically*, that is, *juridicall*, whereas a *Pastors* is but *doctrinall*, you yeeld the cause as we would have it. But then they have a power, not only of *decreeing*, which one *Pastor* hath not; but also of *censuring* upon the disobedience of the people, which you will not easily grant. Againe, I thinke you take the *authority* of a *Presbytery* in a Congregation, to be an *Ordinance* of Christ, and to differ, not only *gradually*, but *specifically*; And the authority of a *Pastor*, or *Teacher*,

To make theie counsel the more weighty and acceptable; but not to invest them with more rule or authority. The way, p 51.



or *Ruling-Elders* single. Now it may seeme strange, if a *Synod* be an *Ordinance* of Christ (as you grant) that a *single Presbytery* should have a *juridicall authority*, to decree and censure; and yet a *Synod*, which is a *Presbytery* of *Presbyteries*, should have but only a *doctrinall authority*: You may rather deny *Synods* to be an *Ordinance* of Christ, and call them (as your Prefacers call the first *Synod* of the Apostles) a *Consultation*, or if you will, a *Reference by way of Arbitration*, for deciding of controversies, &c. Which the particular Churches (unlesse they bind themselves by promise) need not stand to, but may plead their owne *Liberty*. But (say you) [*they have a power, (if they cannot heale the offenders) to determine to withdraw communion from them.*] This power all the Brethren have, as to withdraw from their owne *Elders*, *apostate*: so from other Churches *obstinate*, against their admonitions. Or if you place any *emphasis* in the word (*determine*) that is, to *decree* a separation from them; then you give them a *juridicall power*, which is equivalent with the power of *excommunication*, whereof withdrawing is but the execution.

2. Q. [*How far the Fraternity may concur with the Elders in the power of the Synod.*] You resolve it in 3 particulars: 1. [*They have liberty to dispute their doubts among the Elders, Acts 15. 7. 12.*] The place I thinke is much mistaken. The *disputation*, for ought appeares, was amongst the Apostles and Elders, before the Brethren; not by the Brethren. And when in v. 12. the whole multitude are said to keep silence, it proves not that they did dispute: For 1. certainly that had been too much confusion, for a multitude to speake all at once. 2. Their silence now, argues not that they disputed before; the word *isotynete*, signifies no more but this; they were quiet, or held their peace from noise

noise or murmurings, usuall with multitudes, as at an Assizes; we feare it; they hearkened attentively. 2. [*They had liberty to joyne with the Apostles and Elders, in approving the sentence, and determining the same, as the common sentence of them all.*] That they had a liberty to joyne in approving the sentence, is no more than the multitude at an Assizes have to joyne with the Judge in approving of his sentence: But that they joyned in *determining* the same, as the common sentence of them all, is far more than the multitude have at the Assizes, and is as full Authority as the *Elders* have; And yet this you presently deny, when you say: [*Yet the Authority of the Decrees lay chiefly (if not only) in the Apostles and Elders.*] The Apostles and Elders did no more but joyne with *James* in determining the sentence, as the common sentence of them all. 3. [*They had liberty to joyne with the Apostles and Elders, in chusing and sending messengers, and writing Synodall Letters, in the names of all.*] If you meant no more than a *passive* approbation, it might be yeelded; but if you meane an *actuell*, or *active* concurrence, that they had not been valid without their *votes* and consent; its far more than *liberty*, as good *authority* as any the Apostles and Elders had.

*Obj.* But Elders in a *Synod* have no authority to *determine* any act to bind the Churches, but according to their instructions. You answer: [*We doe not so apprehend it: For what need Churches send to a Synod for light and direction, if they be resolved afore hand, how far they will goe?*] Reply: Here either you destroy the *liberty* of the Brethren, afore granted, and give the *Synod* a binding power, which you seeme to deny: or else *prevaricate* in this cause. For according to your principles, the *Synod* hath no power to bind the Churches to stand to their *arbitrement* (for thats the true power of your *Synods*).



*Synods*) under any penall censure; only they may *withdraw*; And then I returne you your owne words: [*What need Churches send to a Synod for light and direction, &c. if they be resolved afore hand, how far they will goe?*]

3. Q. [*Whether the Synod hath power to enjoyne things both in their nature and use indifferent.*] You resolve it negatively.

1. [*From the patterne of Synods, Acts 15. 28. who enjoyed nothing but necessaries, in nature or use.*]

Sol. This is an Argument from Scripture, *negative*; they did not here enjoyne any thing but necessaries; *ergo*, they had no power to enjoyne things indifferent: The consequence is naught. 2. [*The Apostles are commanded to teach what Christ commanded; ergo, if they teach more, they exceed their commission.*]

Sol. This Argument is like the former: They were to teach what Christ commanded; *ergo*, they might teach nothing else in things indifferent: They might teach nothing as a *commandement* of Christ *doctrinally*, in matters of *Faith* or *worship*; but this hinders not, but they might enjoyne some things indifferent; as they did forbid the use of some things indifferent in their owne nature; *viz. blood, and strangled*. If it be said, those were not *indifferent in their use*, at that time: I answer; There is nothing in the *individuall*, properly indifferent in the *use*; because it falls under some generall rules of Scripture; and so is to be used or not used accordingly: The question therefore should be; [*Whether a Synod may enjoyne (or forbid) the use of a thing in its owne nature indifferent.*] And then I should answer affirmatively, and defend my selfe by this very president of the Apostles, *Acts 15*. Who did forbid the use of some things in their owne nature indifferent: I would not therefore  
answer:

answer: [*Christ speaketh only of teaching such things which he had commanded, as necessary to salvation:*] But I would say, Christ speaks of matters of faith, or worship: That they should teach nothing to be beleaved, as a *Doctrine* of Faith: or practised as a part of Gods worship, but what he had commanded them. Otherwise the Apostles did goe beyond their *commission*, in teaching as *necessary*, to abstaine from bloud, &c. which Christ never commanded them, but rather forbad, in abrogating the Ceremoniall Law. And whereas you say; [*The Apostle 1 Cor. 14. 40. doth not at all enioyne, nor allow the Church to enioyne such things as decent, whose want or whose contrary is not undecent: nor such orders, whose want or contrary would be no disorder.*] I answer: that for men to pray or prophesie with their heads covered, or with long haire, and women uncovered, were things in their owne nature indifferent (unlesse you make it necessary, as a morall duty, for men to pray or prophesie uncovered, and women *contra*; which no Interpreters upon that Text doe) and yet the Apostle enioynes the *Corinthians* so to doe, *ergo*, the *Synod* may doe so too: And for your instance of preaching in a gowne; [*A gowne (say you) is a decent garment to preach in, yet such an injunction (for Ministers to preach in a gowne) is not grounded upon that Text of the Apostle: For then, a Minister in neglecting to preach in a gowne, should neglect the commandement of the Apostle; which yet he doth not; for if he preach in a cloake, he preacheth decently enough.*] True, he sins not in point of *decency*; but supposing such a custome in a Church (as the custome was for men, amongst *Corinthians*, to preach uncovered, and the women to be convened in the Congregations) the *Synod* might enioyne all the Ministers to preach in a gowne, (as the Apostle did enioyne them to preach uncovered) and he that shall preach in a  
I cloke,



cloke, preaches *decently* indeed, but not *orderly*; and so sins against the Apostles rule of *order*, though not of *decency*. You so speake, as if there were only one Rule to be observed, or two at most, in the use of things indifferent; whereas there are at least five to that purpose: And by the same reason, that the Apostle enjoynes men to keep *decency*, he enjoynes to keep *order*; and so other rules, concerning things indifferent. Doth not the Apostle complaine of disorder in the *Corinthians* preaching covered? yet the contrary Order was not necessary, but in it selfe indifferent. The eating of things offered to *Idols*, was a thing in it selfe, before that *decree* of the Apostles, indifferent, 1 Cor. 10. 25. 1 Cor. 8. 8. yet was now forbidden: If you say, this was *offensive to the Jewes*, and *ergo* necessary *pro hic & nunc*: I answer, this reason made it necessary only, where such eating was knowne to be offensive, but the *Canon* made it necessary every where.

3. A third reason is taken (you say) from the nature of the [*Ministeriall Office in Church or Synod: which is stewardly, not Lordly, and ergo, they may dispense no more injunctions to Gods house, than Christ hath appointed them.*] I answer, its true, he may dispense nothing as an *institution* of Christ, but what he hath commanded: But yet a *Steward* may require of the Family, and enioyne them the use of things in themselves indifferent, for Order and *uniformity*. As that all shall meet in such an houre, in such a place, to prayers, &c. So I thinke you doe in your owne Churches. It is indifferent to receive the *Lords Supper* at Morning or at Evening, yet some of you enioyne it to be done at Evening. It is indifferent to *baptize*, in a river, in a paille, in a Font, in a Bason; yet, I beleeve, you enioyne one of these, and forbid the other. And whereas you say, [*Christ in these things never provided*

provided for uniformity, but only for unity.] I answer: then the Apostle exceeded his commission, in enjoining the *Corinthians* uniformity, in their orderly praying or prophesying; yea, unity is much preserved by uniformity.

But you propound a question; [*Whether a Synod hath power of Ordination or excommunication:*] And answer 1. That you doubt it was not so from the beginning. 2. That if any such occasion should arise amongst you, you (in a Synod) should determine it fit to be done, but referre the administration of both, to the Presbytery of severall Churches.] So perhaps would the Presbyteriall Churches. But the question is, what is to be done, if the Officers of the particular Churches be dead, or hereticall, who then shall doe those acts? Either the Synod must doe it, but that you refuse, or a *Classis*, or a *Presbytery* The way, P. 50, 51. of another Congregation; but that you also deny, as having *no warrant*: Then it followes, the Brethren without Officers must both ordaine *Elders*, and *excommunicate* offenders; which you fully grant in the other Tract. But as clearly contradict in this, as is evident in the former Chapter. Page 100.

If it be said, for *Synodical Ordination*, [*that Matthias was so called to be an Apostle, Acts 1.*] you answer: [*It appears not, they acted them in a Synodical way.*] But I pray Sir, remember what you said above, concerning that Synod, Acts 15. [*That it rise up to be a Synod, or generall Councell, by the Apostles presence, they being Elders of all the Churches.*] So it may be said of that Assembly, Acts 1. the Apostles presence, and the whole Church, then extant, there assembled, made it a Synod; and if so, then in a Synod, there was an Apostle ordained: If I may use that word of an Apostle, which I may the better to doe, by your grants, who urge the word *omni-uni-propter*, [*he was voted by the common suffrages of them* The Keyes, P. 120. all.]



Paul and Barnabas were ordained to that Office (of Apostleship) by the imposition of hands of some Officers or members of the Church: The way, p. 45

all.] And if an Apostle, much more a *Deacon*, or other Officers, as *Acts 6.* in another like Assembly. The other instance of the *Presbyters* imposing hands upon *Paul* and *Barnabas*, was not indeed an *Ordination*, properly so called, though you call it a [*separation of them to the worke of the Apostleship,*] nor in a *Synod*, but in a particular Church; yet it was in a *Presbytery* of Prophets and Teachers, perhaps of severall Churches, there occasionally met, and yeelds us this instruction; That *Elders* of one or more Churches, may impose hands, that is, ordaine (in your sense) *Elders* imployed in other Churches; for so were *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Whence we would inferre two things more: 1. That if a *Classis* or *Presbytery* may ordaine, then may a *Synod* ordaine. 2. That however the people or Brethren have no power to ordaine or impose hands: for those were *Prophets* and *Teachers*, that imposed hands on *Paul* and *Barnabas*.

To conclude this Chapter: whereas you said, [*The Synod, Acts 15. did dispense no censure against the false Teachers, an evident argument, they left the censure to the particular Churches.*] I answer: This is an Argument like the former: They dispensed no censure, *ergo*, they had no power, perhaps they revoked their error, and repented, and so there was no need: However, the *Synod* could not censure them, till they knew them obstinate. What was after done, we know not.



CHAP.



## CHAP. VII.

*The first Subject of all this Power ; and of  
Independency.*



Erting passe what is said of Christ, the sove-  
raigne Subject of all power, as out of all que-  
stion, we consider only what you lay of Mi-  
nisteriall power.

1. *Propos.* [A particular Church, or Con-  
gregation of Saints, is the first subject of all the Church-  
offices, with all their spirituall gifts and power,] 1 Cor. 3. 22, &c.  
But, under favour, all the Texts produced to prove the Pro-  
position, are mistaken, or misapplyed. The first, 1 Cor. 3. 22.  
is not spoken to the Church of *Corinth*, or any other parti-  
cular Church, as a peculiar *priviledge* unto them; but either,  
of all Saints in the world, or of those in the Church of *Co-  
rinth*, as Saints, not promiscuously of the whole Church, as a  
Church, consisting of good and bad : For, was *Paul* and  
*Apollos* ; was life and death, were *things present*, and *things to  
come*, given to wicked men and hypocrites in that Church ?  
was *Paul* an Apostle, and *Cephas* another, given as a pecu-  
liar priviledge to the Church of *Corinth* only ? Yea, is not  
this meant of the *invisible mysticall Church*, and not of any  
particular Church ? For the second, 1 Cor. 14. 23. you say,  
[*Theirs was such a Church, of whom it is said ; They came al-  
together*



together into one place.] But we have told you, at the beginning, this was not such a Church as you described, [*A Congregation of Saints professing the faith*] without their Officers: which I thinke you meane here also; (for these things are taken out of, *The way*, p. 1.) This was a Church that had many Officers. The third Text, *1 Cor. 12. 28.* is not meant of a particular Church. For I pray, were the Apostles set in the Church of *Corinth* only, as a particular Church? Were not they Ministers of all, and given to all Churches? Your labour about *it*, some, to referre it to the Apostles, is but a meere *criticisme*; for let it be *some*, or *which*, it matters not. For those Apostles or Prophets were not set in the Church of *Corinth*, as the *first subject* thereof, but in the generall *visible Church*: so the paralell place, *Eph. 4. 12.* is necessarily meant of the Church of Saints, or the body of Christ generally, or indefinitely, not of this or that particular Church. What weake proofes are these, for a proposition of so great concernment, as being the very foundation of the *Independent Government*?

But you read of no *Nationall Church*, nor *Nationall Officers* given to them by Christ: Yet (say we) we reade of Officers more than *Nationall*, given to the Churches, even *universall*, as Apostles and Prophets: And some thinke we reade of *Nationall Officers*, such was *Titus* for *Crete*; as an Evangelist, though we take these to be extraordinary. 2. We read of *Nationall Churches*, living under one common government, as the Churches of *Galatia*, yet but one Church; and the Church of *Ierusalem*, had many Congregations, yet but one Church: And if many Congregations may be called one Church in a City; why all the Congregations in a *Nation*, may not be called one *Nationall Church*, I see no great reason? Not indeed in a *typicall* sense, as the Church  
of

of the Jewes was, a Nationall Church. 3. You grant, that the Officers of particular Churches of a Province, or Nation, may meet, as a *Synod*, by an *Ordinance of Christ*; and there determine, and enioyne things for all their Churches; and this *Synod* you call, a Church of Churches: Now, are not those Officers, Officers to all those Churches, and may not they be called Nationall Officers, in a candid sense? It is therefore a meere *Logomachy*, to dispute, whether there be a Nationall Church, or Nationall Officers, or no: But [*the Officers themselves* (say you) *and the Synods themselves, and all their power, are primarily given to the severall Churches of particular Congregations, either as the first subject in whom they are resident, or as the first object, about whom they are conversant, &c.*] Let me first tell you, you plainly vary the question, which is, of the *first subject*; not of the *first object*.

*John speaks of the dimensions, of many particular Jewish Churches combining together in some causes, even to the communion of a thousand Churches, and all of them will have such mutuall care, and yeeld such mutuall help and communion one to another, as if they were all but one Body. The Keyes, p. 56.*

2. The *first object* of all the Church Officers, is not the particular Churches; certainly the *first object* of the Apostles and Prophets was the generall visible Church, not any particular Church: Nay, every *Pastor* is first given to the whole Church, secondarily to this or that particular Church as the *object*; as I thinke, I have proved above, at least, you doe not sufficiently disprove it: But 3. that the power which a *Synod* puts forth, [*is subjectively first in the Synod*;] is your owne assertion in your 4. proposition; you did therefore much forget your selfe here, to assert the contrary; and thinke to evade, by altering the state of the question, putting the *first object*, for the *first subject*, or joyning them together, when the question is of the *first subject* only. Surely, if the power of a *Synod* be any thing more than the power of a particular Congregation, the particular Congregation cannot be the *first subject*, in whom the power of the *Synod* is.

The Keyes.  
p. 47.



is resident. But when I consider your first proposition better, I begin to thinke your meaning is, that the Church particular, even without Officers, is the first Subject of all Church-power; because 1. such a Church you define in, *The Way*, to be the only instituted Church; and secondly, you give them power to derive their power upon their Officers, in chusing and ordaining them, and then sending them to a *Synod*; and so indeed, they are the first Subject, even of the power put forth in the Synod: But if this be not downright *Brownisme*, I confesse, I know not what is. Let me but make use of your owne *characters* of the first Subject of all power: [*The first subject of any power hath it reciprocally:*] But a particular Congregation of Saints, hath not all Church-offices, and all spirituall power reciprocally: For it may be without all Officers: so cannot fire, the first Subject of heate, be without heate. Againe, take the second character: [*It first putteth forth the exercise of that power.*] But say I, a particular Congregation without Officers, doth not first put forth the power of an *Officer*, or of a *Synod*; ergo, If you say, yet the third will fit it rightly: [*It first communicateth that power to others.*] because the Church first makes her owne Officers, and then imployes them in the Church or Synod. I aske, whether this be not that *extreme* which the *Brethren* speake of, giving [*the chiefe, if not the whole of the power into the hands of the people (without their Officers) as if Christ had radically and originally estated it in the people, Epist. p. 2.*]

2. Propof. [*The Apostles were the first subject of Apostolicall power.*] But then 1. why doe you not say, proportionably, that the *Pastors* are the first Subject of Pastorall power; and the *Ruling-Elders* of Ruling power, &c? 2. If the first Subject of all the Church-offices, with all their  
(spirituall)

spirituall gifts and power, be a particular Congregation, how can you say now, that the Apostles were the *first subject* of Apostolicall power? Nay rather, in your way, the *particular Congregation*, is the *first subject*, even of Apostolicall power; and the Apostles had it by derivation from them; and so make the Church the *Queene*, that bestoweth all these Offices upon her Officers; and so say the Brownists. But to the contrary, its certaine, there were Apostles, who had this Apostolicall power, before there was any particular Congregation; As shall appeare in the particulars.

1. You say, their power stood in this; [*That each Apostle had in him all ministeriall power of all the officers of the Church, Pastors, Teachers, Rulers, Deacons.*] But this is a flat contradiction to your first proposition, That a *particular Congregation* was the *first subject* of all the Church-offices and power: There cannot be two *first subjects*, much lesse three *first subjects* of one Adjunct; and yet here you joyne Evangelists with Apostles, and say, that [*one Apostle or Evangelist, carried about with him the liberty and power of the whole Church; and ergo, might alone baptize and censure.*] If you should say, they received this power from the Church, you say, that which jumps with the Brownists opinion, and that which is apparantly false. Take all your 3. *characters* of a *first subject*: 1. It first receiveth that power. 2. It first puts forth the *exercise* of that power. 3. It first *communicateth* that power to others: They all fall upon the Apostles, before there was any particular Congregation; They first received power from Christ; They first exercised that power; They first communicated that power, by making *Pastors, Elders, Deacons*: Besides, in your other Tract you say, expressly as much, or more. [*One Apostle received both* The way, p. 83. *the*]



the gifts and power of all the Officers of the Church, and might exercise them all alone, without the Church.] Though your Brethren that published that Tract, doe affixe their Starre against it, which (according to their intimation in their Epistle) signifies as much as, *Magister non tenetur*. And no marvell, for you are not constant to your selfe: Your first and second propositions doe directly contradict one another.

2. [*Apostolicall power (say you) extended it selfe to all Churches, as much as to any one; and so they were the first and last subject of Apostolicall power.*] This still makes the contradiction greater: For how then, could you truly say; [*The particular congregation was the first subject of all Church-power:*] when the power of a particular Congregation extends it selfe no further then its owne bounds, and Apostolicall power extends to all Churches? 2. How can you say they were the last subject of all power; when you said afore, The particular congregation is the first subject of all power? And when you say here, [*That ample and universal latitude of power, which was conjoynd in them, is now divided even by themselves, amongst all the Churches, and all the Officers respectively.*] Then it followes 1. That the Church is not the first subject of all power; for it is divided by the Apostles, amongst all the Churches. 2. That the Apostles were not the last subject of all Apostolicall power; for it is left with the Churches and Officers: But still the question is, whom the Apostles did betrust first, with the ordinary power of Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons? The Churches (say you) and the Officers respectively: But what doe you meane? that one part of that power was given first to the Churches; another part, first to the Officers? This is not consentaneous to your first proposition: where you say, [*The Church is the first subject of all Church-offices,*  
and

and all Church power : ] Or doe you meane (as you should, if you speake congruously) that the Church receives all power first, and then distributes it among the Officers respectively ? Then (say I) your *middle way*, falls out to be the extreme of *Brownists* ; who make the people the *first subject* of all power. But I thinke the truth is ; That the Apostles betruſted the power of the Officers, not first with the Churches, but with the Officers themselves : They, and Evangelists, ordained Elders in every City, not the Churches : Paul gives Timothy a charge, [to commit that which he had received of him, to faithfull men, that might be able to teach others also, 2 Tim. 2.2.] To conclude this: You said above, That the *Keyes* were distributed into severall hands ; the *Key* of Liberty unto the *Brethren* ; the *Key* of Authority unto the *Officers* ; and is not this a contradiction to what your first proposition doth assert ; That the *particular Church of Brethren*, is the *first subject* of all Church-offices, and of all Church-power, and so of the Authority of the *Officers* ? consider it.

3. Propos. [When the Church of a particular congregation, walketh together in the truth and peace, the Brethren are the first subject of Church liberty, and the Elders thereof, of Church-authority ; and both, of all Church power, needfull to be exercised amongst themselves.] This is very cautelously delivered, yet not enough to cover your contradiction. Either this proposition is the same with the first, or else it contradicts it. There you said, that the *particular congregation* of Saints, was the *first subject* of all the Church-offices, with all their spirituall gifts and power : Now you divide this power, between them and the Elders ; giving the one Church-liberty, the other, Authority. 2. There is a limitation for this too ; it is but when they walke in truth and



*Peace* : But if they walke not so, what is the *first subject* of all that power? Have not the *Brethren* their *Liberty*, and the *Elders* their *Authority*, as the first Subjects, when they differ? If so; then your caution is idle, [*when they walke in truth and peace* : If not, then neither of them single, nor both together, are the *first subject* of all power needfull to be exercised amongst themselves : And we shall heare anon, a Synod is the *first subject* of all power needfull to be exercised amongst themselves ; *When there are divisions and factions among them*, page 47. Yet againe, in your other Tract, you give the particular Congregation of *Brethren*, the whole power, of chusing, ordaining Officers, and censures of their Officers, if they be hereticall.

1. That the *Brethren* are the *first subject* of Church-liberty, you labour to prove thus : [*By removall of any former subject, whence they might derive it : Not from their Elders ; for they had power to chuse their owne Elders : Not from other Churches, for all Churches are equall : Not from a Synod ; they of Antioch borrowed none of their Liberties from Ierusalem.*] I answer ; the enumeration is not sufficient : For though they received it from none of those, yet they might derive it from some others ; namely, from the *Elders* of other Churches, by whom they were first converted to the *Faith* : For the *Liberties* or priviledges that a Congregation hath, as distinct from *Elders*, comes to them by vertue of their *interest*, either in the *Body mysticall*, or *Catholicke visible Church* ; which is in *Order*, before their membership of a particular Congregation : They must be *visible Saints*, before they can gather into a *congregation* of visible Saints ; and every one single, hath a *liberty* or priviledge to associate, before they can all be associated : Now thence it followes, that those *Elders* that first converted them, did  
virtually

virtually derive that *liberty* or *priviledge* to them ; *Faith* comes by hearing : How shall they heare without a *Preacher*? Remember your owne words : [*The Key of knowledge (or* The Keyes,  
p. 10. *which is all one the Key of Faith)* *belongeth to all the faithfull,* *whether joyned to any particular Church, or no ; which argueth,* *that the key of knowledge is given not only to the Church, but to some before they enter into the Church.*] Now who gave them this *key of Faith*, instrumentally, but [*the Ministers by whom they beleevd:*] Therefore, the Church of a particular Congregation, are not the *first subject* of Church-liberty ; but every particular *Beleever* hath it first, and that derived from some *Elders*. And certainly, in the first *plantation* of Churches, the *Officers, Elders* I meane, were before the Churches themselves : The *Planters* were before the *plantation*. The *Apostles* being first converted and *ordained* by Christ himselte, were sent abroad, and converted people, many times single ; afterwards, when they were increased, they united into Churches. Now, you suppose the Church to be before the *Elders* ; because they chuse their owne *Elders*, which is not generally true. Though it may be so in Churches *planted*, yet not in the first *plantation* of Churches. Indeed, in your way, the Churches are before their *Elders*, and doe chuse and ordaine their *Elders* ; but from the beginning it was not so : And besides, *Elders* now, in order of nature, if not in time, are before the Churches, in all Reformed Churches ; being ordained for the most part to be *Elders*, before they be *Elders* to this or that particular Church : And though your Churches doe chuse their *Elders*, yet I hope they doe not make or *ordaine* them *Elders* ; but after they are *ordained*, chuse them to be theirs. You The Keyes;  
p. 55. speake sometimes of [*translation of an Elder from one Church to another ;*] which, in my apprehension, impl'yes him an



*Elder* before he be translated to another Church: Though I know you are not constant to your selfe herein; holding it as a principle; [*Elder and flocke are relates:*] and giving the *Brethren*, without any *Officers*, power not only to chuse, but to ordaine their *Elders*, and so your Churches are before their *Elders*, and give them their power, by election and ordination; and *Brownists* doe no more. I would gladly know a reason why, if the Churches had power to chuse and ordaine their owne *Officers*, the Apostle should trouble himselfe, and them, to send *Timothy* and *Titus*, to ordaine *Elders* in every City; had it not been easier to have written to the Churches to doe it themselves?

2. That the *Elders* are the *first subject* of Rule and Authority, you endeavour to prove: 1. [*Because the charge of Rule over the Church, is committed to them immediately from Christ.*] But this first, is contradictory to your first proposition, which made the *particular congregation*, the *first subject* of all Church-officers, and all Church-power; and the Church communicates and derives that power to the Officers, chusing and ordaining them. 2. If the charge of Rule be immediately committed to them from Christ, how can the Church be the *first subject* of all power? The Apostles indeed had all their power immediately from Christ; but other *Officers* had it immediately from them, and from others intrusted by them, with that power: When you say, [*The Office it selfe is ordained by Christ, though the Elders be chosen to their Office by the Church of Brethren*] You vary the question: For the question is not, who ordaines the Office; but who ordaines the Officers: Those that the Apostles ordained, had their Office immediately from Christ, but had not their *Ordination* immediately from Christ; that was the *priviledge* of the Apostles. Now from whom

whomsoever the *Officers* derive their *Ordination* immediately, from them immediately they doe derive their Authority. But (say you) the *Officers* doe immediately derive their *Ordination* from the Church of *Brethren*; *ergo*, they derive immediately their Authority from the Church of *Brethren*: And consequently, the Church of *Brethren* is the first subject of *authority*, as well as of *Liberty*, and not the *Elders*. Certainly, all your 3 characters of a first subject, fall upon the Apostles, and their Successors. 1. They first received their power from Christ. 2. They first put forth the exercise of that power. 3. They first communicated that power to others. You say here; [*God hath not given a spirit of Rule and Government ordinarily to the greater part of the body of the Brethren; and ergo, neither hath he given them the first receipt of the Key of Authority, to whom he hath not given the gift to employ it.*] But you give the body of the *Brethren* alone, the first receipt (and exercise too) of the Key of Authority, when you give them power to chuse and ordaine their *Officers* (which *Ordination* is confessed by your selfe, to be an Act of *Rule* and *authority*) *ergo*, you doe directly contradict your selfe, without any possibility of reconciliation, that I can imagine.

The way, p. 48.

*Obj. 1.* How can the *Brethren* invest an *Elder* with *Rule*, if they had not power of *Rule* in themselves? *Sol.* [*Partly by chusing him to that Office, which God hath invested with Rule; partly, by subjecting themselves unto him.*] *Reply 1.* Your first reason is of no validity; chusing to an Office, doth not invest with the *Rule* of that Office. *Election* gives not an Office, but only *nominates* or designes a person fit for that Office: It is *Ordination* that gives the Office, and the *Rule* or *authority* of that Office. The seven *Deacons* chosen by the people, were not *Officers*, till the Apostles had ordained them:



them : If they were not, then *election* gives no Office, and consequently, no *authority* belonging to that Office : If they were, then *Ordination* is a meere empty Ceremony ; and the *Brethren* doe properly give them *authority*, which themselves have not to give : Besides, *election* to this or that place, presupposes (at least sometimes) the party invested with *authority* before (as in the case of translation of an Elder from one Church to another) and only admits him to the exercise of it ; *pro hic & nunc*, as they speake. 2. Your second reason is as weake as the former ; [*Because they professe their subjection to him :*] This cannot invest him with the *Rule*, such as we speake of. Suppose a company of *Brethren* chuse a *gifted Brother* to prophesie to them, and professe their subjection to him in the Lord ; doth this invest him with *authority* of an *Elder*, to rule over them ? If it doe ; then *Ordination* is a thing not necessary, either by the *Brethren* or *Elders* ; (yet by and by we shall heare you require *Ordination of Elders*, to make a compleat *Elder* : ) If it doe not, then you have not satisfied the objection.

*Obj. 2.* The Church is Christs *Spouse, Wife, Queene* ; ergo, she hath the *Keyes of Rule* at her girdle. *Sol.* [*There is a great difference between Queens and poore mens Wives : The first have their Officers for every businesse and service ; and so no Key left in their hands of any Office, but of Liberty, to call for what they want, according to the Kings Royall allowance : But poore mens wives, that have no Officers, may carry the keyes at their owne girdles.*] *Reply.* This answer overthroweth it selfe : For 1. the *liberty* which you grant this *Queene*, the Church, is part of the power of the *Keyes*, and a great part too (if not the whole) viz. to chuse and ordaine her owne *Officers*, and to censure them offending ; which no *Queene* is allowed to doe ; ergo, the Church hath the *Keyes* at her girdle,

dle, which a *Queen* hath not. 2. You say, and that truly, [*The Queene hath only a liberty to call for what she wants;*] but hath no power to make her owne Officers. The *King* doth that by some *Officers* deputed by himselfe for that purpose, to set them apart, to give them their *commission* or oath, &c. Just so it is in the Church: All the *Officers* are given to the Church, *objective*, for the good and benefit of the Church; but they have no power to make and ordaine their owne *Officers*, but only to call upon them for that allowance which the *King* of the Church hath granted them. 3. If poore mens wives may carry the *Keyes* of any Office at their owne girdles, when their husbands have no *Officers*; you seeme to give a greater honour and *liberty* to them, then to *Queenes* or *Ladies*; and withall, you give us leave to inferre, That Churches that have no *Officers* of their owne, are in better case than those that have: They that have *Officers*, have put the *Keyes* in their *Officers* hands: They that have none, may and doe weare them at their owne girdles; which if you affirme (as you often doe) I dare affirme it to be *flat Brownisme*, and not the *middle way*, you pretend.

*Obj.* 3. The whole body naturall, is the *first subject* of all the naturall power; as sight is first in the body, before in the eye. *Sol.* [*It is not in the mysticall, as with the naturall body; there the faculties are inexistent, not so here.*] *Reply* 1. This againe contradicts your first proposition; where you say, a particular Church is the *first subject* of all Church offices and power: And here you say, they are not *actually* *inexistent*; how then is it the first Subject, seeing *accidentis esse, est inesse*? 2. If the Church chuse out of themselves, *Officers* *gifted*, are not they then *inexistent*? 3. You confesse they are in some cases: [*unlesse* (say you) *some of them have all*

L

the



*the gifts of all the Officers, which often they have not.* ] True, but oftentimes they have, either *Presbyters*, or men fit to be *Presbyters*; And then you answer not the objection: And if they have *Presbyters*, before they chuse them to be *theirs*, (as your words seeme to import they may) then they doe not invest them with *power of Elders*, by chusing them, as formerly you seemed to assert. Lastly, you say; [*If the power of the Presbytery were given to a particular Church of Brethren, as such, primo & per se, then it would be found in every particular Church of Brethren.*] But say I, you assert both the *Antecedent* in the first proposition; [*Every particular Congregation is the first subject of all Church power:*] and the *consequence*, when you say; [*Every particular Church hath power to chuse, ordaine, and censure;*] ergo,

*Obj. 4.* The Government is mixt of *Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy*; ergo, the people have some power in Government. *Sol.* Your first answer seemes to yeeld the thing: [*In a large sense, Authority may be acknowledged in the people: As 1. when a man acteth by counsell, he is then Lord of his owne action.*] But thats nothing to the objection. The people of the *Affizes* act by counsell, in approving the sentence: If you grant the Brethren no more, you mocke them, and grant them nothing. 2. But you grant them far more; [*Election of Officers, concurrence in censures, determination of Synodall acts, &c.* (you might have added, *Ordination*, and then you had given them full Authority) *by these they have a great stroke or power in ordering Church affaires.*] A great stroke indeed; as full Authority as you give the *Elders*: And this you grant, when you give your reason to the contrary, and would allow them only *liberty*: [*For (say you) no act of the peoples power or liberty is binding, unlesse the authority of the Presbytery concurre with it.*] No more doth any  
act

act of the *Presbytery* bind, unless the power of the people joyned with it. So say your Prefacers, *Epist. p. 4.* So say your self; when you allow them such a power, as the want thereof retards the sentence. But why doe you darken your owne meaning, by such ambiguous answers? when you grant the Government to be *democraticall*, but not *meerely democraticall*; ] yea, (if I understand any thing) you make it as *meerely democraticall*, as *Brownists* themselves, when you give them power, without any *Officers*, to chuse, ordaine, censure, even *Officers* themselves, as we have often told you. I pray Sir, when the Brethren ordaine, or censure *Officers*, without a *Presbytery*, doth not that act of theirs properly bind? It must, or it is meere vanity, having no *Presbytery* to joyned with them: And if so, is not this properly Authority without more adoe?

But you would prove *Elders* to be the first Subject of Authority, from removall of other Subjects: [*They have it not from the Elders of other Churches, or from a Synod: All Churches and all Elders are equall.*] But 1. This is apparently false in the Scripture way: For the *Elders* of the first Churches were ordained by the Apostles and Evangelists, who were *Elders* of all Churches; and as *Elders*, not as Apostles, ordained *Elders*, and so gave them their Authority immediately from Christ. 2. Your reason, because they are all equall, will hurt your selfe: For if that be a good reason why they cannot derive it from *Elders* of other Churches, because they are equall, it is much more strong against you; they cannot derive it from the people, who are their inferiours: Besides, by this rule, *Elders* of their own Church cannot ordaine any *Elders* to that Church, when they want; for they are all equall: But by your favour, he that is to receive the *Office*, and with it, the Authority of an *Elder*, is



inferiour to those Elders who are to ordaine him ; for *the lesser is blessed of the greater* : though when he is once ordained, he be their equall : And though the Elders of a *Synod* be equall, singly considered ; yet joyntly, they are superiour to any one single, and have more Authority than he hath ; or else, all you speake of *Synods* is but vanity : But if they have not their Authority derived from *Elders* of other Churches, nor from *Synods* ; nor from the Elders of their owne Church, because they are all equall ; either they must derive it from the people, or they have none of all ; and so the people have as much Authority as any Elder of them all ; yea, in your way more.

3. The third branch of the third Propof. [*Both Elders and Brethren together, are the first subject of all power, needfull amongst themselves*] You prove it by instance, 1. [*In point of Ordination : which is compleat, when the people have chosen him, and the Presbytery of the Church have laid their hands upon him.*] But 1. I observe, that here you make *Ordination* an Act of Authority, and place it in the Elders ; *ergo*, either the Brethren cannot ordaine *Elders*, which yet you say they may ; or else, they have Authority, which yet you seeme to deny. 2. Some of your *Brethren* here, hold *Ordination* to be nothing but a ceremoniall solemnity, the substance of a Ministers calling, is (say they) in the peoples *election* ; *ergo*, either Authority is in the people, who give the substance ; and *liberty* only in the *Elders*, who give but the ceremony : or the calling of a *Minister* is compleat without *Ordination*, and yet you require *Ordination* to the integrity of it : But if the Brethren may ordaine without their Officers, then they alone are the first Subject, not of *Liberty* only, but of *Authority* also : And so this Proposition is need-  
lesse.

A second Argument, is taken from [*their independent and indispensable power in Church censures, which are ratified in Heaven,*] The same answer will serve to this also: For first, the Brethren alone without Elders (say you) may censure, and if rightly done, it is *indispensable*, not to be reversed by any power on Earth, because ratified in Heaven; *ergo*, they are the first subject of all Church-power needfull within themselves. 2. And that the rather, if they can ordaine Elders too; for then the Elders derive their power from them. 3. But suppose, (which is possible enough) the Brethren and Elders ere in their censure of a member, is not the censure then reversible? I aske, by whom? if all power needfull for themselves be within themselves, what shall the wronged party doe? Is he remedilessly miserable? If it be dispensable, and reversible, it must be by some other Church or *Classis*, &c. But then, a Congregation of *Brethren and Elders*, are not the first subject of all power needfull amongst themselves. If you say, you meane, when they *walk in truth and peace*; you should yet have told us what the party must doe, when they walke not in truth and peace; And if they have not a power to right a wronged party, they have not all power needfull to be exercised among themselves.

The *Objections* by you brought and answered, rather concerne the *Episcopall*, than the *Presbyteriall* way, at least, some of them, only 2 or 3 may be vindicated.

*Obj 1.* To tell the Church, is to tell the Presbytery of the Church. *Sol.* [*We deny not, the offence is to be told to the Presbytery; yet not to them, as the Church, but as the guides of the Church.*] *Reply.* This is partly to yeeld the cause: For you grant that the businesse is to be told first to the Presbytery; [*who if upon hearing the cause, and examining the witnesses, they find it ripe for publicke censure, they are then to*



*propound it to the Church, &c.* And you grant the people no more, but [*consent to the judgement and sentence of the Elders.*] The Presbytery also are to admonish the party authoritatively; and if he will not heare them, to passe the sentence upon him; *ergo*, the *Presbytery* is the Church there meant, and not the *people*, who neither admonish, nor censure authoritatively, but only discern the nature of the offence, and consent unto the sentence: The Church there meant, is that part of the Church, which the party refuses to heare; but he refuses to heare the Presbytery, who doe speake to him, not the people, who doe not authoritatively speake to him; *ergo*, to tell the Church, is to tell the Presbytery. *Sol. 2.* [*The Church is never put for the Presbytery alone in the New Testament.*] *Reply 1.* This is to beg the question: we say, it must so be understood in this place, and you doe not disprove it. *Nay 2.* you rather confirme it by your answer to the first objection; Our Saviour alludes to the *Church-censure* in the *Jewish Church*: But there the Church censuring, was the *Synagogue*, a Court of the Confistory; *ergo*, as shall further appeare in the next.

*Obj. 2.* In the old Testament, the Congregation is often put for the Elders and Rulers of the Church. *Sol.* [*Not alone, but sitting in the presense of the Congregation.*] *Reply:* That is enough for our purpose: For we doe not deny, but the people might be present, to heare things then, and so they may now: But if the *Elders* be called the Church, as distinct from the people, when they sate in presence of the people, much more may they be called the Church, when they sit alone. And to that custome of the Jewes (your selfe acknowledge in answer to the first objection) doth our Saviour allude; when he sayes, [*Tell the Church.*] But the custome of the Jewes, was to tell the *Elders* and *Rulers*, not the

the people. And whereas you say : [*If a sentence illegall was passed by them, the people did sometimes protest against it, sometime refuse to execute it, and the same they might and ought to doe, at any time, in like cases.*] Though this may be true, when things are done in an illegall way, and evidently illegall (as the instances are) yet it is a dangerous assertion to Government ; for under that pretence, people will take liberty to make void any sentence, if they conceive it but illegall.

Obj. 3. By Church, he meant a Synod, or Classis of Presbyters of many Churches. [*Sol. 1. We find not any where that a Church is put for a Synod of Presbyteries.*] Reply: The question is of this place, and you must not beg, that it is not here meant of a Synod of Presbyteries. If it be meant but of the Congregationall Presbytery, it quite destroyes the power of the people: But we doe not say, it is directly meant of a Synod of Presbyteries, but by a just consequence: If a Congregationall Presbytery be here meant (as we thinke it is) to reclaim a particular offending party in a Congregation: Then by proportion, here is meant a Synod of Presbyteries, when a whole Church erres, or is hereticall ; or else, Christ hath not provided so well for a whole Church, as for a particular person. And thirdly, we cannot see a reason, why a Church may not be taken for a Synod of Presbyteries, as well as a Synod may be called [*A Church of Churches,*] as it is by your selfe, page 49. [*A Congregation of Churches, & Church of Churches, for what is a Synod, but a Church of Churches?*] so you.

Sol. 2. [*As a Congregation cannot reach the removall of all offences: so it may be said, that it were not fit to trouble Synods with every offence; and when they doe meet, they may erre also, and so may a generall Council, and so no remedy for them.*]

Reply



*Reply 1.* We doe not say that *Synods* are to be troubled with every small offence, or to take the businesse of a Congregation out of their hands; but only with greater matters, and when the *Congregationall Presbytery* cannot end them, or is so bad it will not. 2. *Synods* and *Councils* may erre, but not so easily as a particular Congregation: And *alicubi sistendum*, there must be an end of pursuit, and referre the businesse to the judgement of Jesus Christ, the King of the Church. As in case of *Parliaments*, the highest Tribunall that we have, they may erre; and if they doe, private persons must sit downe, or *appeale* to the next. But that is a strange assertion, [*That it was not the purpose of Christ to prescribe a rule for the removall of all offences out of the Church; but only such private and lesse hainous, as grow notorious by obstinacy: For if they be publicke, the Apostle gives another rule, to cast such a person out of all communion, without that admonition, &c.*] *Reply:* The Apostle did not meane absolutely, that they should cast out the *incestuous* person; but supposing his impenitency, and obstinacy, to give satisfaction: For I cannot imagine, that the Apostle would have an humbled, penitent offender cast out of all communion; And you know, it is supposed by many learned *Divines*, the man was not excommunicated, but upon the charge, reproofe, and admonition, yeelded and escaped the censure: Of which, more by and by.

But (say you) *What if the whole Presbytery offend? or such a party as will draw a faction in the Church? The readiest course is to bring the matter to a Synod* ] But you have prescribed two other remedies elsewhere: 1. The Brethren may *withdraw*; or 2. they may proceed to *censure* their whole Presbytery, that is, (I thinke) to *excommunicate* them; why then should they trouble themselves with a *Synod*, which is hardly  
 pro cur ed

procured? *If the Congregation be found faithfull and willing to remove an offence, by due censure, why should the offence be called up to more publick Iudicature, and the plaister made broader than the sore?* They are your owne words, page 42. I forbear the other objections.

*Arg. 3. From the practise and example of the Church of Corinth.* *Obj.* This was the act of Paul, no act of judicall authority in the Church, but rather of subjection to his sentence, &c. *Sol.* [*The judgement of Paul, was not a judicall sentence, delivering him to Satan: but a judicious doctrine, and instruction, teaching them what to doe in that case.*] *Reply:* Thus you may evade that other Text, where yet you grant, that Paul alone did excommunicate Alexander, and justifie his doing of it, as [*having in him the power of the whole Church; and when absent from the Church, or party, he might use it.*] Are not the places paralell? I have delivered him to Satan; and I have judged already, that such an one be delivered to Satan: Else it might be said, Paul did not deliver Alexander to Satan, but only judged it doctrinally, that the Church ought to excommunicate him; And that the Church did, by a *juridicall* sentence, deliver the incestuous person to Satan, is not evident (as I said afore) but rather, that hearing of the Apostles sentence decreed against him, he repented, and so the execution was stayed. *Sufficient unto the man is the rebuke of many, 2 Cor. 2. 6*] As for their forgivenesse of him, it might be only *brotherly*, by way of charity, as offended by him, not *juridicall* by way of authority: For the brethren (by your owne confession) had only Liberty, not Authority, and *ergo*, could not authoritatively forgive him, as nor *authoritatively* bind him: The same power binds and looses: But the *Elders* only did or could authoritatively bind; *ergo*,



*Reply 1.* We doe not say that *Synods* are to be troubled with every small offence, or to take the businesse of a Congregation out of their hands; but only with greater matters, and when the *Congregationall Presbytery* cannot end them, or is so bad it will not. 2. *Synods* and *Councils* may erre, but not so easily as a particular Congregation: And *alicubi sistendum*, there must be an end of pursuit, and referre the businesse to the judgement of Jesus Christ, the King of the Church. As in case of *Parliaments*, the highest Tribunall that we have, they may erre; and if they doe, private persons must sit downe, or *appeale* to the next. But that is a strange assertion, [*That it was not the purpose of Christ to prescribe a rule for the removall of all offences out of the Church; but only such private and lesse hainous, as grow notorious by obstinacy: For if they be publicke, the Apostle gives another rule, to cast such a person out of all communion, without that admonition, &c.*] *Reply:* The Apostle did not meane absolutely, that they should cast out the *incestuous* person; but supposing his impenitency, and obstinacy, to give satisfaction: For I cannot imagine, that the Apostle would have an humbled, penitent offender cast out of all communion; And you know, it is supposed by many learned *Divines*, the man was not excommunicated, but upon the charge, reproofe, and admonition, yeelded and escaped the censure: Of which, more by and by.

But (say you) *What if the whole Presbytery offend: or such a party as will draw a faction in the Church? The readiest course is to bring the matter to a Synod* ] But you have prescribed two other remedies elsewhere: 1. The Brethren may *wish-draw*; or 2. they may proceed to *censure* their whole Presbytery, that is, (I thinke) to *excommunicate* them; why then should they trouble themselves with a *Synod*, which is hardly  
pro cur ed

procured? *If the Congregation be found faithfull and willing to remove an offence, by due censure, why should the offence be called up to more publick Iudicature, and the plaister made broader than the sore?* They are your owne words, page 42. I forbear the other objections.

*Arg. 3. From the practise and example of the Church of Corinth.* *Obj.* This was the act of Paul, no act of judiciall authority in the Church, but rather of subjection to his sentence, &c. *Sol.* *[The judgement of Paul, was not a judiciall sentence, delivering him to Satan: but a judicious doctrine, and instruction, teaching them what to doe in that case.]* *Reply:* Thus you may evade that other Text, where yet you grant, that Paul alone did excommunicate Alexander, and justifie his doing of it, as *[having in him the power of the whole Church; and when absent from the Church, or party, he might use it.]* Are not the places paralell? I have delivered him to Satan; and I have judged already, that such an one be delivered to Satan: Else it might be said, Paul did not deliver Alexander to Satan, but only judged it doctrinally, that the Church ought to excommunicate him; And that the Church did, by a *juridicall* sentence, deliver the incestuous person to Satan, is not evident (as I said afore) but rather, that hearing of the Apostles sentence decreed against him, he repented, and so the execution was stayed. *Sufficient unto the man is the rebuke of many, 2 Cor. 2. 6* ] As for their forgiveness of him, it might be only *brotherly*, by way of charity, as offended by him, not *juridicall* by way of authority: For the brethren (by your owne confession) had only Liberty, not Authority, and *ergo*, could not authoritatively forgive him, as nor *authoritatively* bind him: The same power binds and looses: But the *Elders* only did or could authoritatively bind; *ergo*,



Obj. 2. Some in the Church of Corinth did it ; viz. the Presbytery. Sol. [*It is apparent by the Text, that the Brethren concurred, and that with some act of power ; viz. such power as the want of putting it forth, retarded the sentence, and the putting it forth, was requisite to the administration of the sentence.*] Reply : This is not evident in the Text ; yea, if such power be in the Brethren, surely it is more than liberty, it is direct authority ; viz. a negative vote, to retard the sentence, which is as much as the Elders have : If you meane only a judgement of discretion, and a withdrawing, to execute the sentence, it is true, that liberty they have, a ratioll consent, or dissent ; but that is rather a passive, than an active concurrence to the sentence. But the question is, whether the sentence be null, if they will not concur to it : If so, then the Apostles own sentence might have been nullified, when he delivered this party, or Alexander to Satan ; and he could not say, I have delivered him unto Satan : For it was in the peoples power (and a liberty, you say, purchased for them by Christ) to retard or speed the sentence. Not one of your reasons prove, that the Brethren concurred actively to the sentence : For 1. the whole Church might (and were) reprov'd, for not mourning, and for not withdrawing, for their parts ; not for not sentencing of him. 2. The Commandement was directed to the Church, when gathered together, yet not to all alike ; the presence of the Brethren, the sentence of the Elders : Many things are so directed to a whole Church, which yet must respectively be executed. As if the Apostle should say, when you are all gathered together, I will that there be preaching and administration of Sacraments ; doth this command concerne actively the Brethren ? 3. The Apostles words doe not declare this act of theirs to be a judicall act : when he sayes, [*Doe not you judge*

*judge them that are within?* ] Even this first may be referred to the *Officers*; and secondly, it is by your selfe understood of a *judgement* of discretion, not of authority (of which we speake.) A *judgement* of discretion, is allowed all the people at an *Assizes*; but this hath no power at all in it, properly so called: And truly, if the Apostles words carry any colour of *judgement* in the Brethren, it may seeme to import a *judgement* of authority, rather than of discretion; so he gives them more than you dare plead for; though not more than, I feare, they will ere long usurpe. 4. It is granted, the *Brethren* may and must forgive him, as well as the *Elders*, but not with one and the same kind of *forgiveness*. The people at an *Assizes*, doe in their *judgement of discretion*, acquit the party whom the *Judge* and *Jury* doe acquit, with the judgement of Authority. What poore and weak proofes are these, for a matter of such moment: as easily denied, as affirmed.

*Obj. 3. Corinth was a Presbyteriall Church. Sol. [No such thing appeares.] Reply:* It more than probably appeares, it being a *Mother-City*, where God had much people, and they had many *Elders* and *Teachers*, with excellent gifts (as you grant) it is not likely therefore they had but one Congregation: And if there were many, it may as probably be said, that this command was directed to the *Elders* of severall Congregations, met together, as the contrary can by you be proved.

*Arg. 4. [From the guilt of offence, which lyeth upon every Church, when any offence committed by their members, lyeth uncensured, as on Pergamus, Thyatira, &c.] Sol.* It doth not appeare that those Churches were each, but one single Congregation; but of some of them the contrary; as *Ephesus*, which had many *Elders*, and much people converted,



verted, &c. And besides, I desire you would call to mind, your owne exposition of some of those Texts ; when it is said, [*To the Angell of such a Church ;*] that is, say the Prelaticall party, *To the Bishop* : you answer ; *Angell* is put for *Angels*, a company of *Elders* ; [*Not a single person, but the whole company of the Ministers of the Church, (the whole Presbytery of persons, more than one), as is evident, by his speech unto them as unto many ; unto you, and some of you, &c.*] whence these 3. things may be collected : 1. That the guilt is not imputed to the whole Church, but to the Angell of such a Church ; that is, (say you) the *Ministers* ; which quite destroyes your Argument. 2. That these *Ministers* were a whole *Presbytery* ; the whole company of the *Ministers* of the Church ; therefore its very probable, there were more Congregations than one, in each of those Churches, and so we find *Presbyteriall*, not *Independent* Churches. 3. That the Church is sometime taken for the Presbytery of the Church, which afore you have denyed : However, I pray consider, that the *Brethren* are never called the Angels of the Church ; nor yet are the *Ruling-Elders* any where called Angels, but the Ministers only, as you call these Angels : which makes it more than probable, that it is spoken to a Presbyteriall Church, the Ministers of severall Congregations, even according to your owne exposition ; at least, to the Presbytery of each Congregation, which confutes your assertion, that the *Brethren* have any interest in the power of the *Keyes*.

4. Propos. [*In case a particular Church be disturbed with error, or scandall, and the same maintained by a faction amongst them. Now a Synod of Churches, or of their Messengers, is the first subject of that power and authority, whereby error is judiciously convinced and condemned, the truth searched out,*

out, and determined, and the way of truth and peace declared, and imposed upon the Churches.

This Proposition you undertake to make good by two Arguments: First, [*From the want of power in such a Church, to passe a binding sentence; because the promise of binding and loosing is made to a Church: 1. not erring; 2. agreeing truth, 18. 17, &c.*]

In answer hercunto, I will not say, That this Argument proves not the proposition, for it proves indeed, that a particular Church is not the first Subject of this power and authority, but it doth not prove that a Synod is: But this I say, that by this way of arguing, a Church can seldome or never have power to bind or loose, when there is not an *universall agreement*, which how rarely it happens, experience tells us now, and will doe more hereafter, in your owne Churches: Few Churches there are, that so walke together in peace and truth, that there is no disagreeing party amongst them; therefore that power is seldome in their hands, but upon every difference or faction amongst them, their power reverts to a Synod; and so a Synod must be called (which is not easily done) and troubled with every difference of a Congregation; which you impute (unjustly) as a fault, upon the *Presbyteriall* way. 2. You have otherwise determined in *the way*. Suppose the whole Presbytery be in an error or scandall (as they may) shall the faction now devest the *Brethren* of their power and authority, to censure and cast them out? which you have fully given them there, and here doe seem to take away. 3. You mitigate the businesse much; when you say, [*A Synod of Churches is the first subject of that power, whereby error is convinced, &c. and the way of truth and peace declared and imposed on the Church.*] For all this is only a *doctrinall declaration*, and imposition, not



not *authoritatively*, by way of *jurisdiction*. The *censure* you reserve to the Congregation, where you had placed it before. But what if the *Synod* of Churches erre or disagree, & there be a faction also amongst them? you will know your owne words: [*An erring, or disagreeing Church binds not.*] So all will come to nothing: The censure of the *Synod* binds not; for they can but declare what is truth: The censure of the *particular Church* binds not; for they are in a faction: so you give the *Brethren* a power, and presently take it away againe. If then a *considerable party* fall into error or faction, by variance, they presently lose (like the Bee her sting) their power of binding and loosing; and if this be but once knowne (as it cannot be hid) how easie is it for any *Delinquent* to make a party, or faction, and so escape all binding censure; seeing neither the Church erring, or at variance, nor a *Synod* hath any binding power?

Your second Argument, is, [*From the patterne, Acts 15. 1. &c. When there grew error and faction in the Church of Antioch, they determine not the case, but referred it to the Apostles and Elders.*] But first, the Church of *Ierusalem* did only *doctrinally* declare the truth; they did not censure the *erring Brethren* (so you pleaded above) but referred that to the Church of *Antioch*. 1. If declaration had been sufficient, the Church of *Antioch* needed not to have sent so farre as *Ierusalem*; *Paul* and *Barnabas* were able enough to declare the truth at home; and so, that particular Church, though erring and at variance, was the first subject of that power, here given to a *Synod*. 3. You mislay the comparison; when you say, As in the case of an offence of a faithfull brother, persisted in, the matter is at last judged in a church, which is a Congregation of the faithfull: so in the offence of a Church, the matter is at last judged in a congregation of Churches, &c.]

*ches, &c.*] For the judgement is not of the same kind, but you doe meerely *equivocate* with us. The judgement of the Church upon a *Brother*, is *juridicall*, even by way of *censure*, of *excommunication*: But the judgement of a *Synod* is only *doctrinall* and declarative. If you grant any more, you and we are agreed.

Before I conclude this proposition, I only animadvert these few things: 1. That you grant the *Assembly* of the Apostles and Elders at *Jerusalem*, Acts 15. 1. to have been a *formall Synod*, wherein your Disciples here doe dilcent from you, as appears in their Epistle; and call it only a *Consultation*, by way of *Arbitration*: To which *Arbitration*, it seemes the Church of *Antioch* was not bound to stand; for they did not (for ought appears) promise or bind themselves to stand to their *arbitrement*; nor might they so bind themselves (by your *doctrine*, and theirs too) for that were [*to give away their priviledge purchased by the blond of* The Keyes, *Christ.*] 2. You yeeld also, that the Apostles did not act here- p. 57. in as Apostles, and determine the matter by Apostolicall Authority; but as *Elders*, in an ordinary way, as the whole proceeding in the businesse proves, as you well observe: Yet your *Schollers* here, submit not to your *doctrine*, as they profess in their *Epistle*; though they neither shew any reason for it, nor confute yours. 3. You call a *Synod* a Congregation of Churches (*for what is a Synod, but a Church of Churches*) and yet deny, that a *Presbytery of Churches* is ever called a Church. 4. You say: *The Elders there (at Jerusalem) were not a few, the Beleevers in Jerusalem being many thousands.*] Therefore, say wee, they were more than could meet together in one place, and yet called but one Church: whence we may inferre, There was not an *independent*:



*dependent Church* of one, but a *Presbyteriall Church*, of many Congregations. Lastly, you say, [*This patterne plainly sheweth to whom the Key of Authority is committed, when there groweth offence and difference in a Church.*] But the *Key of Authority* (if you remember what you said above) hath this power in it, as to *administer* the Scales, so to *bind* an obstinate offender under *excommunication*; and to release and forgive him upon repentance. Grant but your *Synod of Churches*, such a *Key of Authority*, to *bind* an offending party, or Church, and to release them upon repentance, and the matter is at an end. But if you grant no more, but a *doctrinall* declarative power, you grant but what every Pastor single hath. And whether this be the *Key of Authority*, given by our Saviour to the Church, let every indifferent Reader judge.

And now you come to your Corollaries, concerning the *Independency* of Churches, to shew how they are, or are not *Independent*: Wherein, I purpose not to follow you; and that for this reason; because, for the most part, you doe but repeate what you have said before: You say, your selfe, [*You take the first Subject, and the Independent Subject to be all one.*] Therefore, say I, if the Church of a particular Congregation be not the *first Subject* of all Church-power, as is evinced above, neither is it the *Independent Subject* of that power. I have only some things to observe in your second Corollarie, and then I shall conclude: You say, [*The establishment of pure Religion, and the Reformation of corruptions in Religion, doe much concerne the civill peace: If Religion be corrupted, there will be warre in the gates, Judges 5. 8. and no peace to him that commeth in, or goeth out, 2 Chron.*

15. 3, 5, 6. But where Religion rejoyceth, the civill State flourisheth.] And this you truly refer to the Civill Magistrate; [partly by commanding, and by stirring up the Churches and Ministers thereof, to goe about it, in their spirituall way: partly also, by civill punishments upon the wilfull opposers and disturbers of the same.] Whereupon I desire to know, 1. By what Authority our Brethren here in Old-England, having not only Christian Magistrates, covenanting to reforme; but also, calling and commanding an Assembly of Divines, to reforme according to the Word, doe take upon them to set up, and establish a forme of Church-Government of their owne, before they have demonstrated it to be the way of God; to the great disturbance of the peace, both of Church and State? 2. I doe demand also, why many of your disciples here, plead for a Toleration of all Religions (which you will not tollerate in New-England) which they call Liberty of conscience, and the prosecution of such disturbers, they call persecution: When as they may heare you say, [It belongs to the Magistrate to punish the wilfull opposers and disturbers of Reformation:] And more then that, you tell them; [Of the Times of the New Testament it is prophesied, that in some cases, capitall punishment shall proceed against false Prophets, and that by procurement of their nearest kindred, Zach. 13. 3. And the execution thereof, is described, Rev. 16. 4. to 7. Where the rivers and fountaines of waters (that is, the Priests and Iesuits, that conveigh the Religion of the Sea of Rome, throughout the Countries) are turned to bloud, that is, have bloud given them to drinke by the civill Magistrate.] Does this



this hold true only against Priests and Jesuits : and  
 are all other *erroneous, schismaticall, blasphemous* Secta-  
 ries to be tolerated ? I leave them to consider it, and  
 you and them to reconcile this and other your many  
 differences and contradictions amongst your  
 selves : And when you are well agreed  
 in the way, we shall consider how  
 farre you agree with  
 the Truth.

---

**FINIS.**

---

**Errata.**

Page 7. l. 22. *and* offender, (and often, after) p. 23. l. last. *r.* institution. p. 24.  
 l. 1. *institution* p. 15. l. 16. *for* p. 26. l. 26. *for* 27. r. p. 30. l. 23. *Arrupt.*  
 p. 32. l. 12. *whom* p. 34. l. last but one, *r.* Counsell. p. 35. l. 8. *Presbyters*.  
 p. 45. l. 7. put out the second (in) p. 53. l. last, *for* And *r.* from p. 55. l. 2. *for*  
*there* *there* p. 76. l. 10. *for* off. *r.* at.

out the Countries) are turned to blood, that is, have blood  
 Given them to drink by the civil Magistrate. Does  
 this

